Center for Immigration Studies

Backgrounder

September 2003

Where Immigrants Live

An Examination of State Residency of the Foreign Born by Country of Origin in 1990 and 2000

By Steven A. Camarota and Nora McArdle

During the 1990s, the nation's immigrant population grew by 11.3 million — faster than at any other time in our history. Using newly released data from the 2000 Census, this report examines the changing distribution of the nation's immigrant population by country of origin at the state level. The findings show that in one sense, today's immigration is more diverse than ever because people now arrive from every corner of the world. In another sense, however, diversity among the foreign born has actually declined significantly. One country — Mexico — and one region — Spanish-speaking Latin America — came to dominate U.S. immigration during the decade. The report also found that immigrants from some countries became more spread out in the 1990s, while the dispersion of others changed little.

Among the report's findings:

- The dramatic growth in the nation's immigrant population has been accompanied by a significant decline in diversity. In 1990, immigrants from the top sending country — Mexico — accounted for 22 percent of the total foreign born. By 2000, Mexican immigrants accounted for 30 percent of the total.

- In fact, Mexico alone accounted for 43 percent of the growth in the foreign-born population between 1990 and 2000.

- In 39 states the share of the immigrant population accounted for by the top sending country increased. The decline in diversity was most dramatic in Arkansas, North Carolina, Georgia, Indiana, Tennessee, Utah, Nebraska, and Alabama.

- Even those states with little diversity among immigrants in 1990 experienced a continued decline in diversity between 1990 and 2000. In Arizona, for example, immigrants from Mexico grew from 55 percent to 67 percent of the foreign born and in Texas, Mexicans increased from 59 to 65 percent of the total.

- Looking at diversity as measured by the share of immigrants from just one region of the world also shows a significant decline in diversity. Nationally, immigrants from Spanish-speaking Latin American countries increased from 37 percent to 46 percent of the total foreign-born population during the 1990s.

- Immigrants from Spanish-speaking Latin America accounted for more than 60 percent of the growth in the foreign-born population nationally in the 1990s.

- In 2000, there were 33 states (including the District of Columbia) in which immigrants from Spanish-speaking Latin American countries were

Steven A. Camarota is Director of Research at the Center for Immigration Studies in Washington, D.C. Nora McArdle was an intern at the Center and is currently a graduate student at Duke University.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the largest single group. Europeans were the largest group in 11 states, East Asian immigrants were the largest in four states and Canadian immigrants were the largest in three states.

- Declining diversity was mainly due to very uneven growth in the size of different immigrant groups. For example, the number of immigrants from Spanish-speaking Latin America increased by seven million and those from East Asia rose by over two million. In contrast, the number of immigrants from Europe increased by less than 700,000 and those from Sub-Saharan Africa increased by about 400,000.

- Immigrants from some countries became much more dispersed during the decade. For example, the percentage of immigrants from Mexico, the Dominican Republic, and El Salvador concentrated in only one state fell significantly during the decade.

- In contrast, immigrants from Cuba became more concentrated, while the share of immigrants from such countries as Iran, Columbia, Jamaica, and Haiti concentrated in one state remained virtually unchanged in the 1990s.

This report is based on newly available 2000 Census long form data, which was released for public use in June of this year.[1] One in six households receives the long form questionnaire, which includes questions on whether someone is an immigrant and in what country they were born. This report compares the results from the 1990 and 2000 Census long forms. The definitions of "immigrant" and "foreign born" in this study are the same as that used by the Census Bureau. The foreign born are persons living in the United States who were not U.S. citizens at birth. This includes naturalized American citizens, legal permanent residents (green card holders), illegal aliens, and those on long-term temporary visas such as students or guest workers. Analysis done by the Census Bureau, INS, and others indicates that seven to eight million illegal aliens and one million persons on long-term temporary visas, such as students and temporary workers, responded to the 2000 Census.

Because all children born in the United States to immigrants are by definition natives, the sole reason for the dramatic increase in the immigrant population at the national level is new immigration. At the state level, growth in the immigrant population can be caused both by new immigration from abroad and by the arrival of immigrants from other states. While some immigrants die and others return home, the granting of permanent residency and the settlement of hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens greatly exceeds deaths and out-migration for immigrants from most countries.

Immigrant Settlement Across States

Table 1 (starts on page 7) reports the top 15 countries of birth for immigrants in 2000 for each state plus the District of Columbia. In each state, the countries are ranked based on the top sending nation in 2000. (It is important to note that some of the countries that were lower ranked in 1990 are no longer in the top 15 by 2000. Conversely, some of the top 15 countries in 2000 were not among the top 15 in 1990.) Table 2 (page 13) shows the percentage of the total foreign-born population accounted for by the top sending country in each state at the start and end of the decade. The first column in Table 2 shows the share of each state's immigrant population accounted for by the top sending country in 2000; the second column shows the top country's share in 1990. The third column shows the percentage point change, and the fourth column shows the percentage change in the immigrant population's diversity. (A percentage point change reflects the increase or decrease in the share of the state's foreign-born population represented by the top sending country. In contrast, the percentage change reports the size of the change relative to the level of diversity in 1990. In North Carolina, for example, the top country accounted for 10 percent of the immigrant population in 1990 and 41 percent in 2000 — a 31 percentage point increase. But this change also can be expressed as a 295 percent change. A positive percentage point or percentage change indicates that there was a decline in the diversity of the state's immigrant population.

Decline in Diversity Is Widespread. Tables 1 and 2 show that in most states the top sending country accounted for a much larger share of the total in 2000 than in 1990. Overall, there were 39 states where diversity decreased. In 24 of these states the top country

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

grew as a share of the total foreign born by at least 10 percentage points. In contrast, there were only 11 states in which the top country represented a smaller share of the foreign born in 2000 than in 1990 — that is, where there was an increase in diversity. Of the 11 that increased in diversity, there was only one in which the top country fell as a share of the total foreign born by more than 10 percentage points. Thus increases in diversity were relatively rare and modest compared to decreases in diversity.

In many cases the decline was due to the top sending country in 1990 increasing its share of the total by 2000. However, in many states the top country changed during the 1990s. In 15 of the 39 states where diversity declined, the top sending country changed during the decade. Thus, in some cases there was a shift in the leading sending country, while in other states there was an acceleration of an already existing pattern. The most dramatic declines in diversity can be found in Arkansas, North Carolina, Georgia, Indiana, Tennessee, Utah, Nebraska, and Alabama. But even in some states that had little diversity in 1990, the situation become more pronounced during the decade. In Arizona, for example, immigrants from Mexico grew from 55 percent to 67 percent of the foreign born and in Texas, Mexicans increased from 59 to 65 percent of the total. Even in California, a state synonymous with immigrant diversity, Mexican immigrants increased as a share of the total foreign born from 38 to 44 percent.

The decline in diversity among immigrants is widespread and is not confined to a few states or even one part of the country. Of the 24 states where the top country's share increased by 10 percentage points or more, eight are in the South, seven are in the Midwest and nine are in the West. Only the Northeast didn't experience a significant decline in diversity. But even in that region, there were only a few states where diversity actually increased. In New York and New Jersey, the states with the largest immigrant populations in that part of the country, diversity actually declined slightly in the 1990s.

Diversity Decline and Differential Growth Rates. The decline in diversity reflects the very different rate of growth among immigrant groups. Table 3 (Page 14) reports the growth during the 1990s for the largest sending countries in 2000. The table shows that the rate of increase varied significantly by country.[2] For example, the number of immigrants living in the United States from Italy, Germany, Ireland, and Greece actually declined during the decade. The number of immigrants from such countries as Laos, Canada, Portugal, and the United Kingdom remained roughly constant. In sharp contrast, the number from Mexico and most countries in the Western Hemisphere increased significantly during the decade. The number of immigrants from the former Soviet Union, Pakistan, and India also increased dramatically during the decade. Immigrant populations from East Asian countries such as China, the Philippines, and Vietnam also grew very significantly, though not as dramatically as the numbers from the Western Hemisphere or South Asia. Despite very significant growth among countries other than Mexico, that country still accounted for 43 percent of the total increase in the foreign-born population. This means that eventually if the trend continues, Mexico will come to account for 43 percent of the total foreign born, perhaps within the next 15 years, assuming there is no change in immigration policy.

Different rates of increase reflect many factors: the arrival of new legal immigrants, new illegal immigration, rates of return migration, and deaths. For example, the dramatic decline in the number of Italian immigrants was due to low levels of new immigration from that country, coupled with very high death rates among the group because so many are long time residents and are now quite old. America's immigration policy is primarily based on family relationships, therefore those groups that had the most young immigrants in 1990, who might want to bring in their relatives, tended to send the most immigrants in the 1990s.

Mexico Top Sending Country in Most States. Table 2 shows the top sending country for each state (the same information can be found in Table 1). Nationally, Mexican immigrants increased their share of the foreign-born population from 22 percent of the total in 1990 to 30 percent by 2000. This continues a long-term trend: In 1980 Mexico, already the leading sending country, accounted for 16 percent of the foreign-born population. The trend of declining diversity goes back even farther; in 1970 the top sending country was Italy, and it represented only 10 percent of the foreign born. At the state level, Mexico was the largest sending country in 18 states in 1990; by 2000 it was the top sending country in 30 states. Table 2 shows that in most places where it was not the leading country in 1990 but became so during the decade, it displaced Germany as the top sending country. The Mexi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can immigrant population is growing so rapidly because it is not only the leading sending country for legal immigration, but also because of the enormous growth in illegal immigration from that country. The Immigration and Nationalization Service (INS), before it was absorbed into the Department of Homeland Security, estimated that the illegal alien population from Mexico grew by nearly 2.8 million between 1990 and 2000, accounting for 80 percent of the total increase in the illegal population.[3] In fact, the INS estimates indicate that in 2000 roughly half of the Mexican-born population in the United States was illegal. Because Mexico dominates both legal and illegal immigration to the United States, it represents a large and rapidly growing share of the total foreign-born population.

While mostly related to immigration from Mexico, the decline in diversity was not only associated with that country. In Alaska, for example, Filipino immigrants went from 21 to 28 percent of the total and in Hawaii they went from 45 to 49 percent of the total. In Montana, immigrants from Canada went from 29 to 40 percent of the total and in New York, Dominican immigrants went from 8 to 11 percent of the total foreign born. While some of these declines in diversity are not very large, it does suggest that declining diversity can occur even in the absence of large-scale immigration from Mexico.

Diversity Based on Region of Origin. Diversity among the foreign-born can be measured in many ways. While tables 1 and 2 examined diversity by country, Table 4 (page 15) shows the growth in the immigrant population at the national level based on the region of the world from which they came. The table attempts to categorize immigrants by region in a way that reflects the cultural or linguistic similarities between immigrants from different countries. The Census Bureau typically groups countries only by the continent from which they came. For example, immigrants from Turkey, India, and China are all grouped together by the Bureau as simply "Asian," even though these countries share little in common. In contrast, Table 4 divides Asia into East Asia, South Asia, and the Middle East (the Middle East includes North Africa). Moreover, instead of treating all immigrants from the Western Hemisphere, except Canada, as "Latin American," as the Census Bureau does, Table 4 groups the Spanish Speaking countries of the Western Hemisphere into one group. The Anglophone, Francophone, and Lusophone countries of the region are grouped together as a separate region and Canada is treated as its own region. Africa is also divided between the north, which is part of the Middle East, and the Sub-Saharan region. Grouping countries in this way provides a more accurate picture of immigrants by region of the world, allowing for more meaningful comparisons between immigrant groups than is possible if they were simply categorized by continent.

Measuring diversity by region of birth reveals a similar picture to that found in Tables 1 and 2. Although about 5 percent of immigrants did not indicate their country of birth in 1990, compared to about 1 percent in 2000, it is unlikely this would significantly change the results in Table 4. The results for race and Hispanicity for those immigrants that did not provide their country of birth indicate that their distribution across regions is very similar to those immigrants who did report where they were born.

Table 4 shows very different growth rates for immigrants by region of the world. For example, the number immigrants from Spanish-speaking Latin America increased by nearly seven million and the number from East Asia rose by over two million. In contrast, the number from Europe increased by less than 700,000 and the number from Sub-Saharan Africa increased by fewer than 400,000. Table 5 (Page 16) reports the top sending region in each state in 2000 and 1990. The table indicates that in 2000, Spanish-speaking countries from Latin America were the top-sending countries in 33 states, up from 12 states in 1990. In 11 of the 12 states where Spanish-speaking immigrants were already the largest group in 1990, they increased their share of the foreign born. In addition, in 21 other states immigrants from Spanish-speaking Latin America displaced another part of the world as the leading sending region. While in general states that declined in diversity went from having Europe as the top-sending region to Latin America, this was not true in every state. In Oklahoma, Georgia, Oregon, and Tennessee, East Asia was the leading sending region in 1990, but by 2000 Spanish-speaking Latin America was the leader.

Ways to Measure Diversity. Of course, there are limits to how well the regions used in Tables 4 and 5 actually measure diversity. The countries of some regions may share more in common with each other than those in other regions. For example, while Europe is a region of great linguistic, religious, and economic diversity, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Middle East has less religious diversity, though it is still diverse in other ways. This may be especially true for those individuals who actually emigrate to the United States. While there are certainly differences between Latin American countries, Spanish-speaking Latin America is probably the most homogenous of the world's regions as defined here. Despite differences within regions, Tables 4 and 5 suggest that when immigrants are grouped into regions, there has been a decline in diversity at least when measured by the share represented by the top sending region. This decline took place both at the national level and in many states.

Immigrants by State

So far we have only examined the settlement of immigrants by state, Tables 6, 7, and 8 look at this question from the other direction. Tables 6 and 7 (pages 17 and 20) show the top seven states of settlement for the 100 largest countries in 1990 and 2000. Table 8 (page 23) reports the share of immigrants from the 40 largest countries living in only one state. Examining immigration in this way is important because it creates a better understanding of the distribution of immigrant groups across the United States, and how this changed in the 1990s.

Concentrations by Country. The tables show great variation between immigrant groups. Of the countries listed in Table 8, there were 11 in which 20 percent or less lived in one state in 2000. Immigrants from these countries are spread throughout the United States. Among the most diffuse immigrants are those from Germany, Nigeria, Canada, the former Yugoslavia, India, Peru, Brazil, and the United Kingdom. Of course, not all immigrants exhibit defuse settlement; there were 14 nations in which more than 40 percent of the immigrants lived in just one state. Those from Cuba, Guyana, the Dominican Republic, Iran, Trinidad & Tobago, Philippines, El Salvador, Ecuador, Guatemala, and Mexico tend to be the most concentrated. In general, European and South Asian immigrants tend to be the most dispersed, while those from the Western Hemisphere tend to be the most concentrated. Those from East Asia tend to fall in the middle of the distribution.

Changing Concentrations in the 1990s. In terms of the changing distribution of immigrants by country during the 1990s, we also see great variation between countries. In Table 8, about half of the countries became more dispersed during the decade, while the concentration of the other half remained about the same. The largest increase in dispersion was among immigrants from Guatemala, Mexico, Cambodia, El Salvador, the Dominican Republic, and Laos. Most of the countries that became more evenly spread out across the country were those that tended to be the most concentrated in 1990. Thus, it should not be too much of a surprise that these highly concentrated immigrant groups tended to become more dispersed over the last 10 years. Even so, many of these countries remain among the more concentrated in 2000, despite an increase in dispersion.

Table 8 also shows that not all immigrants became more dispersed. Immigrants from Cuba, Poland, and Brazil actually became somewhat more concentrated between 1990 and 2000. In general immigrants did become more dispersed over the last ten years, but this was by no means a universal trend among all immigrant groups.

Conclusion

Using the newly released 2000 Census data, this report has examined the changing settlement patterns of immigrants across America. The data show that along with a historically unprecedented increase in the number of immigrants, there has been a significant decline in the diversity of the nation's foreign-born population. The decline in diversity occurred not only at the national level, but also in many states. Most states saw the leading sending country increase its share of the total foreign born during the 1990s. When immigrants are grouped by the region of the world from which they came, the same general pattern exists. Mexico, specifically, and Spanish-speaking Latin American countries in general now comprise a larger percentage of the foreign born than any other country or region of the world.

Of course, diversity could be defined in other ways. Race or language diversity are other possible ways of examining the issue. But these variables are highly correlated with country and region of origin so the results are likely to be very similar. It is unlikely there exists one best way to examine diversity among immigrants. The data show that the top sending country and region increased their share of the total foreign born nationally and in many states over the last decade. This decline in diversity was the result of very

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

different rates of growth among immigrant groups.

There is also the question of the starting point for any comparison. While we compare 1990 to 2000, we could have compared 1980 to 2000. This does not mean the decline in diversity would necessarily be any less dramatic. For example, Mexico, the top sending country in 1980, increased it share of the total from 16 percent in that year to 22 percent by 1990 and 30 percent in 2000. In 1970 the top sending country — Italy — accounted for only 10 percent of the foreign born. Thus there is 30-year decline in diversity, at least as measured by the share represented by one country. It also should be pointed out that when mass immigration was beginning in the mid-nineteenth century, Ireland accounted for an even larger share of the foreign born than Mexico does today. However, Ireland's standing as the top country was temporary and transitory. It was soon replaced by the nations that became Germany, though it probably makes more sense to see "Germany" as a cultural-linguistic collection of countries through much of this period, the way Spanish-speaking Latin America is today. Germany was later displaced by Italy. For at least the last 120 years, no country has accounted for such a large share of the foreign born as Mexico does today.

We also examined the changing settlement patterns of immigrants by country and found significant variations between countries. While immigrants from some countries tend to be very concentrated, those from other countries tend to be very dispersed. In general, European and South Asian immigrants tend to be the most dispersed, while those from Spanish-speaking Latin America tend to be the most concentrated. We also found that those countries that were the most concentrated in 1990 tended to exhibit the largest relative increase in dispersion, though they often remained among the most concentrated even in 2000. However, increasing dispersion was not a universal trend; the concentration of immigrants from many countries changed little or not at all during the decade.

What of the costs or benefits of the declining diversity or the changing distribution of immigrants by country across the United States? It seems reasonable to assume that the changing nature of immigration must have some implications for American society. While outside of the scope of this study, the most serious potential problem associated with a larger and less diverse immigrant population is that it may hinder the assimilation and integration of immigrants by creating the critical mass necessary to foster linguistic and spatial isolation. In contrast, a more diverse immigrant population may increase incentives to learn English or become familiar with American cultural more generally. The English language and American culture are the means by which diverse groups communicate with each other and the larger society. But if one group dominates in an area, then this could fundamentally reduce the need to Americanize.

On the other hand, there may be benefits to less diversity among immigrants. For example, if most immigrants in a state come from one cultural-linguistic group, then providing welfare or other government services may be easier for government agencies because they will only have to sensitize themselves to the needs of one immigrant community in order to deliver services. In addition, natives might find it easer to live in areas of heavy immigrant settlement if there is one dominant group because they will only have to learn to become familiar with one culture. For example, an American may only have to learn one foreign language rather than several in order to be employable.

It must be pointed out that this report does not address the costs or benefits created by the changing patterns of immigrant settlement. What it does provide is an detailed description of an important change taking place in American society.

Endnotes

[1] The 1 percent census data for 1990 and 2000 were provided by the University of Minnesota. Steven Ruggles and Matthew Sobek et al. Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 3.0 Minneapolis: Historical Census Projects, University of Minnesota, 2003. www.ipums.org

[2] The public use file of the 1990 Census shows that a much larger share of the foreign born population did not record a country than in the 2000 Census. While this does not have a large impact on the overall results, it may affect the results for small countries.

[3] The entire INS report, including figures for Mexico, can be found at www.immigration.gov/graphics/shared/aboutus/statistics/Ill_Report_1211.pdf

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Table 1. Leading Immigrant-Sending Countries by State (1990 and 2000)

Source: Center for Immigration Studies analyses of 1990 and 2000 Public Use Micro data files.
Figures may not exactly match published numbers in every case because public use data files are slightly different from those used by the Census Bureau.

Alabama

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**88,118**	**42,141**	**45,977**
1. Mexico	27,103	1,155	25,948
2. Germany	7,177	5,451	1,726
3. India	4,589	2,191	2,398
4. China/HK/Taiwan	4,252	2,573	1,679
5. Vietnam	3,364	2,283	1,081
6. Guatemala	3,163	90	3,073
7. United Kingdom	3,152	2,645	507
8. Korea	2,884	2,339	545
9. Canada	2,413	2,425	-12
10. Former USSR	2,289	190	2,099
11. Philippines	2,195	1,212	983
12. Italy	1,738	404	1,334
13. Nigeria	1,426	639	787
14. Thailand	1,235	588	647
15. Kenya	1,048	48	1,000

Alaska

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**33,813**	**22,789**	**11,024**
1. Philippines	9,555	4,773	4,782
2. Korea	3,757	2,676	1,081
3. Mexico	3,106	1,281	1,825
4. Canada	2,993	2,452	541
5. Laos	1,788	1,710	78
6. Former USSR	1,065	127	938
7. Germany	823	1,668	-845
8. Vietnam	758	225	533
9. Thailand	738	318	420
10. Romania	644	23	621
11. Japan	623	1,171	-548
12. Haiti	578	11	567
13. El Salvador	503	23	480
14. Panama	481	61	420
15. Peru	460	130	330

Arizona

	2002	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**649,127**	**274,424**	**374,703**
1. Mexico	435,001	150,606	284,395
2. Canada	28,218	15,332	12,886
3. Germany	15,980	10,928	5,052
4. United Kingdom	15,615	9,297	6,318
5. China/HK/Taiwan	11,408	6,152	5,256
6. Philippines	11,299	4,732	6,567
7. Vietnam	8,470	4,326	4,144
8. India	8,457	3,431	5,026
9. Korea	8,025	4,154	3,871
10. Former USSR	6,458	1,873	4,585
11. Guatemala	5,759	1,699	4,060
12. Former Yugoslavia	5,302	1,252	4,050
13. Italy	5,139	4,034	1,105
14. Japan	4,434	2,793	1,641
15. El Salvador	4,254	1,617	2,637

Arkansas

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**74,054**	**25,005**	**49,049**
1. Mexico	31,422	2,931	28,491
2. El Salvador	6,452	246	6,206
3. Germany	3,405	2,688	717
4. Vietnam	2,861	1,349	1,512
5. Marshall Islands	2,604	250	2,354
6. United Kingdom	2,292	2,002	290
7. Philippines	2,098	698	1,400
8. China/HK/Taiwan	1,711	695	1,016
9. Mongolia	1,516	n/a	1,516
10. India	1,402	572	830
11. Former USSR	1,382	134	1,248
12. Guatemala	1,322	143	1,179
13. Laos	1,249	1,555	-306
14. Japan	1,228	745	483
15. Korea	1,167	538	629

California

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**8,817,243**	**6,417,052**	**2,400,191**
1. Mexico	3,889,695	2,434,652	1,455,043
2. Philippines	670,560	484,277	186,283
3. China/HK/Taiwan	556,283	382,992	173,291
4. Vietnam	408,581	267,883	140,698
5. El Salvador	375,356	279,010	96,346
6. Korea	269,346	197,000	72,346
7. Guatemala	205,885	135,284	70,601
8. India	197,918	85,054	112,864
9. Former USSR	181,800	84,739	97,061
10. Iran	160,456	117,184	43,272
11. Canada	135,135	150,084	-14,949
12. United Kingdom	131,648	135,995	-4,347
13. Japan	111,453	97,238	14,215
14. Germany	92,481	105,413	-12,932
15. Nicaragua	70,001	6,426	63,575

Colorado

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**380,841**	**139,890**	**240,951**
1. Mexico	192,427	32,712	159,715
2. Germany	20,485	14,358	6,127
3. Canada	15,415	8,355	7,060
4. United Kingdom	12,325	7,986	4,339
5. Vietnam	11,635	5,511	6,124
6. Korea	11,594	7,431	4,163
7. Former USSR	10,111	4,467	5,644
8. India	9,285	1,791	7,494
9. China/HK/Taiwan	8,586	4,863	3,723
10. El Salvador	6,054	714	5,340
11. Japan	5,141	3,423	1,718
12. Philippines	4,316	3,255	1,061
13. Italy	3,348	1,776	1,572
14. Poland	3,290	2,334	956
15. Laos	3,209	2,082	1,127

(Table 1 continues through page 12)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Connecticut

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**375,006**	**277,449**	**97,557**
1. Poland	29,861	20,916	8,945
2. Jamaica	28,757	16,328	12,429
3. Italy	26,443	34,973	-8,530
4. Canada	20,720	21,987	-1,267
5. United Kingdom	16,190	16,737	-547
6. India	15,722	6,956	8,766
7. Portugal	14,821	14,082	739
8. Colombia	13,222	5,396	7,826
9. Mexico	12,994	2,720	10,274
10. Germany	12,513	13,976	-1,463
11. China/HK/Taiwan	11,406	5,908	5,498
12. Former USSR	11,092	8,430	2,662
13. Brazil	10,726	3,353	7,373
14. Ecuador	10,127	2,344	7,783
15. Guatemala	7,414	1,244	6,170

Delaware

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**41,839**	**21,370**	**20,469**
1. Mexico	8,053	1,019	7,034
2. India	3,756	1,246	2,510
3. China/HK/Taiwan	2,809	1,541	1,268
4. Guatemala	2,792	32	2,760
5. Germany	2,754	1,470	1,284
6. United Kingdom	2,070	2,357	-287
7. Former USSR	1,957	510	1,447
8. Philippines	1,398	724	674
9. Haiti	1,368	85	1,283
10. Korea	1,109	751	358
11. Bangladesh	1,108	n/a	1,108
12. Canada	979	932	47
13. Pakistan	893	183	710
14. Poland	878	664	214
15. Italy	862	1,188	-326

District of Columbia

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**70,659**	**58,425**	**12,234**
1. El Salvador	13,214	9,427	3,787
2. China/HK/Taiwan	2,808	1,911	897
3. United Kingdom	2,612	2,293	319
4. Jamaica	2,409	3,045	-636
5. Dominican Rep.	2,368	1,125	1,243
6. Ethiopia	2,273	1,769	504
7. Mexico	2,177	775	1,402
8. Nigeria	1,815	1,185	630
9. Guatemala	1,788	1,139	649
10. Germany	1,580	1,705	-125
11. France	1,499	1,083	416
12. Guyana	1,451	1,015	436
13. Honduras	1,333	216	1,333
14. Trinidad & Tobago	1,330	1,547	-217
15. Vietnam	1,330	548	782

Florida

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**2,640,882**	**1,656,429**	**984,453**
1. Cuba	652,660	495,849	156,811
2. Mexico	189,819	54,414	135,405
3. Haiti	166,778	81,837	84,941
4. Colombia	157,307	65,066	92,241
5. Jamaica	127,591	76,853	50,738
6. Canada	100,922	76,517	24,405
7. Nicaragua	98,021	72,017	26,004
8. United Kingdom	73,029	60,523	12,506
9. Dominican Rep.	69,449	23,556	45,893
10. Germany	64,409	55,628	8,781
11. Honduras	50,599	22,069	28,530
12. Peru	49,919	22,661	27,258
13. Venezuela	47,646	14,481	33,165
14. Philippines	45,642	23,457	22,185
15. Brazil	43,082	8,682	34,400

Georgia

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**573,255**	**172,040**	**401,215**
1. Mexico	196,011	19,748	176,263
2. Vietnam	32,811	5,129	27,682
3. India	25,084	7,600	17,484
4. Korea	22,624	11,181	11,443
5. Germany	22,520	13,494	9,026
6. China/HK/Taiwan	18,605	7,704	10,901
7. Canada	17,141	7,279	9,862
8. United Kingdom	15,382	10,572	4,810
9. El Salvador	13,849	1,453	12,396
10. Guatemala	12,354	1,043	11,311
11. Jamaica	11,845	3,454	8,391
12. Colombia	9,664	2,004	7,660
13. Philippines	9,524	4,614	4,910
14. Pakistan	6,563	1,775	4,788
15. Nigeria	6,492	3,538	2,954

Hawaii

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**213,762**	**165,072**	**48,690**
1. Philippines	104,862	74,957	29,905
2. China/HK/Taiwan	23,086	16,141	6,945
3. Japan	19,840	18,389	1,451
4. Korea	16,450	13,054	3,396
5. Vietnam	6,551	5,717	834
6. Micronesia	5,187	902	4,285
7. Western Samoa	4,810	2,668	2,142
8. Canada	4,454	4,237	217
9. Germany	3,995	2,509	1,486
10. Tonga	3,406	1,776	1,630
11. United Kingdom	1,622	1,851	-229
12. Thailand	1,435	1,221	214
13. Mexico	1,293	1,443	-150
14. Sweden	1,187	276	911
15. Marshall Islands	1,151	451	700

Idaho

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**65,150**	**28,376**	**36,774**
1. Mexico	37,204	11,716	25,488
2. Canada	4,490	3,452	1,038
3. Former Yugoslavia	2,290	84	2,206
4. Germany	2,236	1,656	580
5. Former USSR	1,437	452	985
6. Philippines	1,419	456	963
7. China/HK/Taiwan	1,283	920	363
8. Vietnam	1,282	192	1,090
9. United Kingdom	1,278	852	426
10. Sudan	1,136	n/a	1,136
11. India	1,091	32	1,059
12. Japan	974	720	254
13. Switzerland	868	88	780
14. Korea	806	376	430
15. Romania	780	64	716

Illinois

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**1,531,231**	**939,684**	**591,547**
1. Mexico	609,068	274,476	334,592
2. Poland	139,729	83,574	56,155
3. India	86,242	38,235	48,007
4. Philippines	67,840	47,370	20,470
5. Former USSR	56,274	26,982	29,292
6. China/HK/Taiwan	50,383	29,985	20,398
7. Korea	37,787	28,818	8,969
8. Former Yugoslavia	35,258	20,565	14,693
9. Germany	33,882	41,592	-7,710
10. Italy	25,259	34,368	-9,109
11. Guatemala	22,355	11,163	11,192
12. Pakistan	21,893	7,674	14,219
13. Canada	20,348	17,094	3,254
14. United Kingdom	20,329	21,960	-1,631
15. Greece	17,708	19,920	-2,212

Indiana

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**194,992**	**96,909**	**98,083**
1. Mexico	61,336	10,433	50,903
2. Germany	11,921	9,221	2,700
3. Korea	7,997	3,555	4,442
4. Canada	7,979	5,805	2,174
5. India	7,753	4,652	3,101
6. Former USSR	7,584	2,911	4,673
7. United Kingdom	7,310	6,210	1,100
8. China/HK/Taiwan	6,977	4,730	2,247
9. Former Yugoslavia	6,391	3,281	3,110
10. Philippines	5,647	3,087	2,560
11. Vietnam	4,099	1,781	2,318
12. Japan	4,030	3,644	386
13. Poland	3,832	2,973	859
14. Honduras	2,892	186	2,892
15. El Salvador	2,767	240	2,767

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Iowa

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**85,847**	**44,819**	**41,028**
1. Mexico	19,987	3,747	16,240
2. Vietnam	7,770	2,663	5,107
3. India	5,429	2,221	3,208
4. Former Yugoslavia	5,395	136	5,259
5. Korea	5,036	2,436	2,600
6. Germany	4,373	4,755	-382
7. Former USSR	4,368	3,747	621
8. Canada	3,444	2,699	745
9. China/HK/Taiwan	3,166	2,828	338
10. El Salvador	2,180	565	1,615
11. United Kingdom	2,075	2,111	-36
12. Cambodia	1,985	518	1,467
13. Laos	1,945	3,095	1,150
14. Philippines	1,901	849	1,052
15. Guatemala	1,512	159	1,353

Kansas

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**138,845**	**61,562**	**77,283**
1. Mexico	64,896	14,760	50,136
2. Vietnam	8,518	4,397	4,121
3. Germany	5,915	4,975	940
4. India	5,479	2,584	2,895
5. China/HK/Taiwan	4,785	3,100	1,685
6. Philippines	4,762	1,378	3,384
7. Canada	4,600	2,529	2,071
8. Laos	4,284	2,185	2,099
9. Korea	3,284	2,786	498
10. United Kingdom	3,028	2,889	139
11. El Salvador	2,577	452	2,125
12. Former USSR	2,504	1,430	1,074
13. Pakistan	1,373	409	964
14. Japan	1,332	1,272	60
15. Iran	1,262	651	611

Kentucky

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**79,796**	**32,559**	**47,237**
1. Mexico	13,577	803	12,774
2. Germany	6,707	5,259	1,448
3. India	5,148	1,351	3,797
4. United Kingdom	4,435	2,356	2,079
5. Former Yugoslavia	4,276	148	4,128
6. Korea	4,040	2,129	1,911
7. China/HK/Taiwan	3,383	1,496	1,887
8. Canada	3,284	1,984	1,300
9. Cuba	3,023	588	2,435
10. Vietnam	2,724	973	1,751
11. Japan	2,289	1,552	737
12. Philippines	1,902	831	1,071
13. Former USSR	1,775	633	1,142
14. France	1,141	396	745
15. Bangladesh	1,127	n/a	1,127

Louisiana

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**110,708**	**85,425**	**25,283**
1. Vietnam	16,995	10,884	6,111
2. Honduras	9,317	7,221	2,096
3. Mexico	7,394	3,369	4,025
4. India	6,375	3,483	2,892
5. Nicaragua	5,918	3,378	2,540
6. Germany	5,366	4,122	1,244
7. Cuba	4,811	4,611	200
8. United Kingdom	4,228	3,438	790
9. Canada	3,601	2,520	1,081
10. Philippines	3,570	2,520	1,050
11. China/HK/Taiwan	3,291	3,729	-438
12. El Salvador	2,318	1,047	1,271
13. France	1,927	1,326	601
14. Nigeria	1,880	798	1,082
15. Former Yugoslavia	1,630	426	1,204

Maine

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**38,808**	**36,842**	**1,966**
1. Canada	15,149	18,784	-3,635
2. Germany	2,714	2,396	318
3. United Kingdom	2,465	3,109	-644
4. Former Yugoslavia	2,032	163	1,869
5. Former USSR	1,968	273	1,695
6. Cambodia	1,049	417	632
7. Korea	1,020	313	707
8. Vietnam	962	577	385
9. Philippines	919	866	53
10. Spain	852	106	746
11. South Africa	679	62	617
12. Japan	655	492	163
13. India	655	330	325
14. Afghanistan	568	36	532
15. Iran	481	n/a	481

Maryland

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**531,359**	**308,706**	**222,653**
1. El Salvador	37,980	13,865	24,115
2. China/HK/Taiwan	34,166	18,277	15,889
3. Korea	31,254	20,409	10,845
4. India	28,088	17,547	10,541
5. Philippines	23,276	12,473	10,803
6. Former USSR	21,348	8,800	12,548
7. Jamaica	20,804	11,875	8,929
8. Mexico	19,797	3,939	15,858
9. Vietnam	16,159	7,376	8,783
10. United Kingdom	16,135	12,536	3,599
11. Germany	15,566	15,881	-315
12. Nigeria	14,528	5,306	9,222
13. Trinidad & Tobago	12,466	6,710	5,756
14. Iran	11,734	7,125	4,609
15. Guatemala	10,212	3,340	6,872

Massachusetts

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**772,653**	**573,040**	**199,613**
1. Portugal	75,382	72,015	3,367
2. China/HK/Taiwan	53,495	31,047	22,448
3. Dominican Rep.	41,551	19,044	22,507
4. Brazil	38,566	10,830	27,736
5. Former USSR	38,561	19,026	19,535
6. Canada	38,043	52,910	-14,867
7. Haiti	33,640	18,716	14,924
8. Vietnam	31,805	13,021	18,784
9. Italy	30,208	38,413	-8,205
10. India	26,790	11,815	14,975
11. United Kingdom	25,658	27,217	-1,559
12. El Salvador	21,103	6,909	14,194
13. Ireland	17,918	20,764	-2,846
14. Germany	14,712	13,894	818
15. Colombia	14,628	6,492	8,136

Michigan

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**526,459**	**352,312**	**174,147**
1. Mexico	62,289	13,151	49,138
2. Canada	53,704	53,807	-103
3. India	39,470	13,013	26,457
4. Iraq	27,176	13,994	13,182
5. China/HK/Taiwan	24,307	10,536	13,771
6. Germany	23,685	23,995	-310
7. United Kingdom	20,921	24,131	-3,210
8. Lebanon	17,072	11,041	6,031
9. Former Yugoslavia	17,017	10,838	6,179
10. Korea	17,004	8,319	8,685
11. Italy	16,517	18,475	-1,958
12. Poland	16,296	19,156	-2,860
13. Former USSR	15,218	10,567	4,651
14. Philippines	12,412	9,632	2,780
15. Vietnam	10,053	5,053	5,000

Minnesota

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**261,030**	**115,097**	**145,933**
1. Mexico	45,557	3,833	41,724
2. Laos	26,281	15,153	11,128
3. Vietnam	13,406	6,776	6,630
4. Korea	13,312	3,926	9,386
5. Former USSR	11,826	4,393	7,433
6. Canada	10,399	10,407	-8
7. Thailand	10,229	3,666	6,563
8. India	8,968	2,787	6,181
9. China/HK/Taiwan	8,487	4,571	3,916
10. Philippines	8,156	3,410	4,746
11. Somalia	7,995	n/a	7,995
12. Germany	5,675	8,075	-2,400
13. Nigeria	5,523	781	4,742
14. United Kingdom	4,530	4,730	-200
15. Ethiopia	4,435	1,082	3,353

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mississippi

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**40,134**	**20,997**	**19,137**
1. Mexico	8,401	729	7,672
2. Vietnam	3,386	1,995	1,391
3. Germany	2,631	1,992	639
4. China/HK/Taiwan	2,481	1,179	1,302
5. Korea	2,366	747	1,619
6. United Kingdom	2,229	2,058	171
7. Canada	1,998	1,356	642
8. India	1,799	1,374	425
9. Philippines	1,536	1,113	423
10. Honduras	1,350	165	1,185
11. Cuba	1,148	249	899
12. Thailand	706	153	553
13. Colombia	695	27	668
14. Nicaragua	590	81	509
15. Ireland	516	306	210

Missouri

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**151,108**	**82,769**	**68,339**
1. Mexico	30,573	4,642	25,931
2. China/HK/Taiwan	9,476	4,857	4,619
3. Vietnam	8,164	3,960	4,204
4. Germany	8,038	8,779	-741
5. India	7,598	2,664	4,934
6. Former Yugoslavia	6,858	1,518	5,340
7. Canada	6,502	4,144	2,358
8. Philippines	6,296	3,638	2,658
9. Former USSR	5,549	2,561	2,988
10. United Kingdom	5,147	5,183	-36
11. Korea	4,957	3,489	1,468
12. Italy	2,537	2,673	-136
13. Iran	2,130	1,307	823
14. Japan	2,011	2,383	-372
15. Haiti	2,006	237	1,769

Montana

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**14,607**	**13,724**	**883**
1. Canada	5,780	4,009	1,771
2. United Kingdom	1,248	1,041	207
3. Germany	798	1,333	-535
4. El Salvador	571	n/a	571
5. France	506	116	390
6. Mexico	505	225	280
7. Netherlands	483	169	314
8. Sweden	414	447	-33
9. Malaysia	413	7	406
10. Korea	389	326	63
11. Philippines	344	369	-25
12. China/HK/Taiwan	252	448	-196
13. Singapore	252	n/a	252
14. Poland	230	244	-14
15. Norway	206	397	-191

Nebraska

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**75,702**	**26,294**	**49,408**
1. Mexico	28,996	3,893	25,103
2. Vietnam	6,076	689	5,387
3. Germany	3,241	2,431	810
4. Guatemala	3,217	n/a	3,217
5. Former USSR	2,963	2,003	960
6. China/HK/Taiwan	2,710	1,391	1,319
7. Korea	2,366	920	1,446
8. India	1,962	1,022	940
9. El Salvador	1,733	237	1,496
10. Canada	1,689	982	707
11. Former Yugoslavia	1,483	109	1,374
12. United Kingdom	1,462	1,840	-378
13. Iraq	1,368	38	1,330
14. Philippines	1,109	890	219
15. Honduras	812	204	608

Nevada

	2,000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**305,573**	**103,962**	**201,611**
1. Mexico	142,685	32,180	110,505
2. Philippines	33,046	7,339	25,707
3. El Salvador	12,243	2,996	9,247
4. Canada	11,845	6,744	5,101
5. China/HK/Taiwan	8,845	3,493	5,352
6. Korea	7,551	3,204	4,347
7. Cuba	7,206	4,400	2,806
8. United Kingdom	7,168	5,138	2,030
9. Germany	6,023	4,654	1,369
10. Guatemala	5,507	1,069	4,438
11. Vietnam	4,373	2,836	1,537
12. Japan	4,316	1,715	2,601
13. Thailand	2,738	1,606	1,132
14. Nicaragua	2,644	1,113	1,531
15. Argentina	2,467	561	1,906

New Hampshire

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**53,135**	**40,182**	**12,953**
1. Canada	12,321	12,859	-538
2. Dominican Rep.	3,454	637	2,817
3. United Kingdom	3,140	3,851	-711
4. India	2,973	1,193	1,780
5. Germany	2,623	2,956	-333
6. China/HK/Taiwan	2,375	1,042	1,333
7. Former Yugoslavia	2,262	43	2,219
8. Colombia	2,232	409	1,823
9. Brazil	2,057	157	1,900
10. Korea	1,956	770	1,186
11. Vietnam	1,329	104	1,225
12. Greece	1,140	1,275	-135
13. Philippines	1,071	491	580
14. Italy	1,055	802	253
15. Former USSR	1,001	503	498

New Jersey

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**1,481,157**	**959,127**	**522,030**
1. India	117,687	52,672	65,015
2. Dominican Rep.	106,120	35,179	70,941
3. Colombia	79,902	40,354	39,548
4. China/HK/Taiwan	71,035	34,328	36,707
5. Philippines	70,670	38,043	32,627
6. Mexico	64,614	12,679	51,935
7. Poland	59,182	39,441	19,741
8. Italy	58,699	69,449	-10,750
9. Cuba	52,515	61,280	-8,765
10. Korea	50,092	27,949	22,143
11. Former USSR	47,687	23,192	24,495
12. Peru	43,436	19,911	23,525
13. Ecuador	43,224	20,186	23,038
14. Portugal	35,273	34,598	675
15. Germany	34,154	43,421	-9,267

New Mexico

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**146,347**	**78,669**	**67,678**
1. Mexico	103,153	48,414	54,739
2. Canada	4,749	2,334	2,415
3. Germany	3,971	3,456	515
4. United Kingdom	3,817	3,171	646
5. China/HK/Taiwan	2,323	1,110	1,213
6. Philippines	2,300	891	1,409
7. India	2,036	789	1,247
8. Vietnam	1,679	945	734
9. Switzerland	1,406	114	1,292
10. Japan	1,388	1,101	287
11. Guatemala	1,324	852	472
12. Korea	1,193	1,032	161
13. Former USSR	1,160	300	860
14. Italy	1,101	741	360
15. Former Yugoslavia	1,099	63	1,036

New York

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**3,804,431**	**2,822,756**	**981,675**
1. Dominican Rep.	415,026	235,790	179,236
2. China/HK/Taiwan	292,717	188,985	103,732
3. Former USSR	233,724	103,938	129,786
4. Jamaica	214,993	143,298	71,695
5. Mexico	170,386	43,570	126,816
6. Italy	147,372	189,759	-42,387
7. Guyana	130,154	76,536	53,618
8. Ecuador	127,451	65,678	61,773
9. Haiti	123,737	85,086	38,651
10. India	117,889	69,129	48,760
11. Colombia	112,484	83,570	28,914
12. Poland	97,643	89,136	8,507
13. Trinidad & Tobago	97,073	63,226	33,847
14. Korea	91,568	71,389	20,179
15. Philippines	74,061	49,275	24,786

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

North Carolina

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**436,513**	**115,380**	**321,133**
1. Mexico	179,236	8,751	170,485
2. Germany	18,558	11,994	6,564
3. Vietnam	16,083	3,975	12,108
4. China/HK/Taiwan	14,777	5,562	9,215
5. United Kingdom	14,706	8,388	6,318
6. India	14,343	5,856	8,487
7. Canada	12,728	6,855	5,873
8. Korea	11,146	5,304	5,842
9. El Salvador	10,388	906	9,482
10. Philippines	7,955	3,492	4,463
11. Former USSR	6,916	747	6,169
12. Laos	6,456	1,524	4,932
13. Honduras	6,320	315	6,005
14. Guatemala	5,466	270	5,196
15. Japan	4,773	4,044	729

North Dakota

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**10,933**	**9,510**	**1,423**
1. Canada	3,253	3,110	143
2. Somalia	1,268	n/a	1,268
3. India	1,014	135	879
4. Vietnam	685	270	415
5. Kenya	633	n/a	633
6. Germany	582	830	-248
7. Former USSR	547	560	-13
8. Former Yugoslavia	456	n/a	456
9. China/HK/Taiwan	381	135	246
10. Iran	380	65	315
11. Mexico	304	170	134
12. United Kingdom	254	440	-186
13. Tonga	184	n/a	184
14. Italy	178	65	178
15. Norway	152	555	-403

Ohio

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**339,645**	**255,129**	**84,516**
1. India	26,072	12,009	14,063
2. Mexico	23,216	4,293	18,923
3. Germany	21,566	24,518	-2,952
4. China/HK/Taiwan	21,161	10,670	10,491
5. Former USSR	20,834	10,752	10,082
6. Canada	18,911	15,042	3,869
7. Former Yugoslavia	15,568	15,257	311
8. United Kingdom	14,052	18,104	-4,052
9. Korea	12,164	6,566	5,598
10. Italy	11,082	18,275	-7,193
11. Philippines	10,394	6,600	3,794
12. Vietnam	9,070	3,283	5,787
13. Japan	8,887	7,248	1,639
14. Romania	7,711	4,919	2,792
15. Poland	7,173	8,575	-1,402

Oklahoma

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**133,216**	**63,472**	**69,744**
1. Mexico	58,145	15,158	42,987
2. Vietnam	9,562	5,133	4,429
3. Germany	6,731	5,272	1,459
4. Canada	5,577	2,352	3,225
5. China/HK/Taiwan	5,061	2,745	2,316
6. India	4,860	2,384	2,476
7. United Kingdom	4,531	3,084	1,447
8. Guatemala	3,753	279	3,474
9. Philippines	3,661	1,686	1,975
10. Korea	3,567	2,712	855
11. Japan	1,987	1,737	250
12. Thailand	1,910	689	1,221
13. Indonesia	1,577	336	1,241
14. Laos	1,551	856	695
15. Iran	1,551	1,057	494

Oregon

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**296,997**	**137,279**	**159,718**
1. Mexico	117,297	29,705	87,592
2. Former USSR	17,767	3,710	14,057
3. Vietnam	17,462	7,295	10,167
4. Canada	17,185	16,383	802
5. China/HK/Taiwan	10,692	6,474	4,218
6. Korea	10,595	5,412	5,183
7. United Kingdom	10,569	7,192	3,377
8. Germany	8,930	8,426	504
9. Philippines	7,782	4,227	3,555
10. India	6,563	1,989	4,574
11. Japan	6,124	3,733	2,391
12. Guatemala	4,656	440	4,216
13. Romania	4,653	1,422	3,231
14. El Salvador	2,827	490	2,337
15. Laos	2,602	2,827	-225

Pennsylvania

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**497,050**	**364,949**	**132,101**
1. Former USSR	44,998	20,484	24,514
2. India	38,767	18,013	20,754
3. Italy	28,752	40,381	-11,629
4. China/HK/Taiwan	28,287	16,795	11,492
5. Korea	27,427	16,250	11,177
6. Mexico	24,306	6,194	18,112
7. Germany	24,230	27,998	-3,768
8. Vietnam	23,110	13,029	10,081
9. United Kingdom	19,648	25,544	-5,896
10. Philippines	15,199	8,277	6,922
11. Canada	15,104	12,504	2,600
12. Poland	11,530	13,637	-2,107
13. Jamaica	10,036	6,548	3,488
14. Dominican Rep.	9,078	1,884	7,194
15. Greece	8,693	8,987	-294

Rhode Island

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**126,046**	**94,357**	**31,689**
1. Portugal	23,357	23,702	-345
2. Dominican Rep.	16,172	5,980	10,192
3. Guatemala	8,390	2,937	5,453
4. Cape Verde	7,007	3,794	3,213
5. Colombia	6,372	4,922	1,450
6. Italy	4,979	5,720	-741
7. Canada	4,199	5,845	-1,646
8. United Kingdom	3,760	4,349	-589
9. Cambodia	3,180	2,376	804
10. Former USSR	2,807	1,878	929
11. Poland	2,654	1,363	1,291
12. Philippines	2,592	1,179	1,413
13. China/HK/Taiwan	2,455	2,047	408
14. Germany	2,152	1,661	491
15. Haiti	2,138	649	1,489

South Carolina

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**116,571**	**47,859**	**68,712**
1. Mexico	30,524	1,653	28,871
2. Germany	8,857	6,447	2,410
3. India	6,597	2,124	4,473
4. United Kingdom	6,483	4,812	1,671
5. China/HK/Taiwan	6,211	1,110	5,101
6. Philippines	6,116	3,084	3,032
7. Canada	5,683	3,168	2,515
8. Costa Rica	3,300	162	3,138
9. Vietnam	3,048	783	2,265
10. Korea	2,781	1,704	1,077
11. Colombia	2,762	522	2,240
12. Guatemala	1,915	195	1,720
13. Former USSR	1,754	564	1,190
14. Peru	1,562	120	1,442
15. Japan	1,417	1,773	-356

South Dakota

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**14,705**	**7,298**	**7,407**
1. Ethiopia	2,806	104	2,702
2. Canada	1,529	980	549
3. Germany	1,032	574	458
4. Mexico	857	136	721
5. Former USSR	813	562	251
6. Colombia	738	10	728
7. India	689	97	592
8. United Kingdom	566	306	260
9. Philippines	550	247	303
10. Former Yugoslavia	517	n/a	517
11. Sudan	467	n/a	467
12. Korea	454	298	156
13. Iran	413	58	355
14. Thailand	395	132	263
15. El Salvador	394	n/a	394

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tennessee

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**167,999**	**57,564**	**110,435**
1. Mexico	51,174	2,019	49,155
2. Germany	7,999	6,135	1,864
3. India	7,129	2,961	4,168
4. Canada	6,918	4,152	2,766
5. United Kingdom	6,403	4,386	2,017
6. China/HK/Taiwan	6,124	2,577	3,547
7. Korea	5,853	2,607	3,246
8. Philippines	4,186	2,511	1,675
9. El Salvador	4,092	45	4,047
10. Japan	4,043	2,940	1,103
11. Vietnam	3,882	1,542	2,340
12. Former USSR	3,513	573	2,940
13. Haiti	3,367	21	3,346
14. Iraq	2,829	327	2,502
15. Iran	2,743	1,440	1,303

Texas

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**2,885,734**	**1,497,287**	**1,388,447**
1. Mexico	1,870,787	888,026	982,761
2. Vietnam	104,356	53,871	50,485
3. El Salvador	98,247	45,917	52,330
4. India	78,172	31,953	46,219
5. China/HK/Taiwan	67,366	38,141	29,225
6. Philippines	45,665	25,929	19,736
7. Canada	40,247	21,380	18,867
8. Germany	40,041	34,398	5,643
9. Korea	34,469	22,680	11,789
10. United Kingdom	34,385	27,917	6,468
11. Honduras	31,430	9,795	21,635
12. Pakistan	28,714	7,563	21,151
13. Nigeria	22,421	9,343	13,078
14. Guatemala	21,540	10,009	11,531
15. Colombia	18,567	12,426	6,141

Utah

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**159,237**	**56,834**	**102,403**
1. Mexico	64,921	8,365	56,556
2. Canada	7,196	5,749	1,447
3. China/HK/Taiwan	6,250	2,648	3,602
4. Tonga	5,755	1,712	4,043
5. Germany	5,433	5,995	-562
6. United Kingdom	5,239	3,677	1,562
7. Former USSR	4,589	566	4,023
8. Vietnam	4,524	2,238	2,286
9. Peru	4,260	568	3,692
10. Guatemala	3,589	275	3,314
11. Philippines	3,581	1,149	2,432
12. El Salvador	3,449	331	3,118
13. Netherlands	2,928	2,077	851
14. Former Yugoslavia	2,423	96	2,327
15. Korea	2,379	1,233	1,146

Vermont

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**25,629**	**17,271**	**8,358**
1. Canada	8,146	6,612	1,534
2. United Kingdom	3,218	1,443	1,775
3. Former Yugoslavia	2,554	26	2,528
4. Vietnam	1,852	125	1,727
5. China/HK/Taiwan	1,382	505	877
6. Germany	1,278	1,608	-330
7. Japan	716	231	485
8. Korea	599	203	396
9. India	443	214	229
10. Ecuador	417	n/a	417
11. France	365	292	73
12. Marshall Islands	347	n/a	347
13. Austria	287	250	37
14. Former Czech.	287	67	220
15. Argentina	260	10	250

Virginia

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**584,982**	**307,506**	**277,476**
1. El Salvador	55,293	21,003	34,290
2. Korea	39,346	23,385	15,961
3. Philippines	36,548	22,416	14,132
4. Mexico	35,210	7,905	27,305
5. Vietnam	31,479	19,485	11,994
6. India	29,665	11,682	17,983
7. China/HK/Taiwan	23,522	12,327	11,195
8. Germany	21,148	16,536	4,612
9. United Kingdom	21,049	16,494	4,555
10. Peru	16,661	4,350	12,311
11. Pakistan	15,950	4,404	11,546
12. Guatemala	15,095	3,567	11,528
13. Bolivia	13,316	5,478	7,838
14. Canada	13,067	9,303	3,764
15. Iran	10,979	8,325	2,654

Washington

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**614,524**	**317,337**	**297,187**
1. Mexico	149,281	44,493	104,788
2. Canada	48,666	43,893	4,773
3. Philippines	46,382	27,621	18,761
4. Former USSR	43,846	4,878	38,968
5. Vietnam	41,636	16,224	25,412
6. Korea	36,811	20,784	16,027
7. China/HK/Taiwan	35,876	18,432	17,444
8. Germany	19,405	19,251	154
9. United Kingdom	17,219	16,638	581
10. Cambodia	17,160	7,878	9,282
11. India	15,500	3,711	11,789
12. Japan	14,912	12,726	2,186
13. Thailand	8,419	3,549	4,870
14. Laos	5,891	5,112	779
15. Poland	5,637	2,415	3,222

West Virginia

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**17,189**	**15,891**	**1,298**
1. Germany	1,749	1,530	219
2. China/HK/Taiwan	1,695	1,026	669
3. India	1,621	1,333	288
4. Philippines	1,531	955	576
5. Mexico	1,204	154	1,050
6. Canada	1,002	954	48
7. Italy	948	1,401	-453
8. Korea	929	509	420
9. Pakistan	747	383	364
10. United Kingdom	638	1,644	-1,006
11. Japan	610	519	91
12. Greece	474	215	259
13. Lebanon	474	303	171
14. Spain	438	291	147
15. Bulgaria	420	94	326

Wisconsin

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**190,731**	**116,749**	**73,982**
1. Mexico	57,638	9,990	47,648
2. Laos	15,762	12,183	3,579
3. Germany	11,881	16,226	-4,345
4. China/HK/Taiwan	7,716	4,071	3,645
5. India	7,688	2,531	5,157
6. Canada	7,429	5,467	1,962
7. Former USSR	6,583	4,940	1,643
8. Korea	6,365	2,811	3,554
9. Thailand	6,205	3,364	2,841
10. United Kingdom	5,355	5,384	-29
11. Vietnam	5,013	1,976	3,037
12. Philippines	4,591	2,458	2,133
13. Poland	3,950	4,992	-1,042
14. Italy	3,244	3,956	-712
15. Japan	2,681	1,542	1,139

Wyoming

	2000	1990	Growth
Total FB Pop.	**10,577**	**8,423**	**2,154**
1. Mexico	4,785	2,139	2,646
2. Canada	1,529	968	561
3. Germany	706	1,008	-302
4. United Kingdom	522	1,108	-586
5. France	521	119	402
6. Argentina	409	n/a	409
7. Japan	387	219	168
8. South Africa	372	48	324
9. Sweden	205	53	152
10. Australia	187	34	153
11. India	149	39	110
12. Brazil	135	n/a	135
13. Philippines	131	90	41
14. Portugal	130	99	31
15. Papua New Guinea	130	n/a	130

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Table 2. Top Immigrant Sending Country in 2000 and 1990, Ranked by Change in Diversity

	2000		1990			
State	Sending Country	% of Imm. Population	Sending Country	% of Imm. Population	Percentage-Point Change	Percentage Change
1. Arkansas	Mexico	42 %	Mexico	11 %	32	297 %
2. North Carolina	Mexico	41 %	Germany	10 %	31	295 %
3. Georgia	Mexico	34 %	Mexico	12 %	23	197 %
4. Indiana	Mexico	31 %	Mexico	11 %	21	191 %
5. Tennessee	Mexico	30 %	Germany	11 %	20	185 %
6. Utah	Mexico	41 %	Mexico	15 %	26	177 %
7. Nebraska	Mexico	38 %	Mexico	15 %	24	159 %
8. Alabama	Mexico	31 %	Germany	13 %	18	138 %
9. Iowa	Mexico	23 %	Germany	11 %	13	120 %
10. Wisconsin	Mexico	30 %	Germany	14 %	16	117 %
11. Colorado	Mexico	51 %	Mexico	23 %	27	116 %
12. Mississippi	Mexico	21 %	United Kingdom	10 %	11	114 %
13. Kansas	Mexico	47 %	Mexico	24 %	23	95 %
14. South Carolina	Mexico	26 %	Germany	14 %	13	94 %
15. Missouri	Mexico	20 %	Germany	11 %	10	91 %
16. Oregon	Mexico	39 %	Mexico	22 %	18	83 %
17. Oklahoma	Mexico	44 %	Mexico	24 %	20	83 %
18. Wyoming	Mexico	45 %	Mexico	25 %	20	78 %
19. Delaware	Mexico	19 %	United Kingdom	11 %	8	75 %
20. Washington	Mexico	24 %	Mexico	14 %	10	74 %
21. Nevada	Mexico	47 %	Mexico	31 %	16	51 %
22. South Dakota	Ethiopia	19 %	Canada	13 %	6	42 %
23. Idaho	Mexico	57 %	Mexico	41 %	16	38 %
24. Illinois	Mexico	40 %	Mexico	29 %	11	36 %
25. Montana	Canada	40 %	Canada	29 %	10	36 %
26. Alasaka	Philippines	28 %	Philippines	21 %	7	35 %
27. Minnesota	Mexico	17 %	Laos	13 %	4	32 %
28. New York	Dominican Rep.	11 %	Dominican Rep.	8 %	3	30 %
29. Virginia	El Salvador	9 %	Korea	8 %	2	24 %
30. Arizonia	Mexico	67 %	Mexico	55 %	12	22 %
31. Louisiana	Vietnam	15 %	Vietnam	13 %	3	21 %
32. California	Mexico	44 %	Mexico	38 %	6	16 %
33. Dist. of Columbia	El Salvador	19 %	El Salvador	16 %	3	16 %
34. New Mexico	Mexico	70 %	Mexico	62 %	9	15 %
35. New Jersey	India	8 %	Italy	7 %	1	10 %
36. Texas	Mexico	65 %	Mexico	59 %	6	9 %
37. Maryland	El Salvador	7 %	Korea	7 %	1	8 %
38. Hawaii	Philippines	49 %	Philippines	45 %	4	8 %
39. Kentucky	Mexico	17 %	Germany	16 %	1	5 %
40. West Virginia	Germany	10 %	United Kingdom	10 %	0	-1 %
41. North Dakota	Canada	30 %	Canada	33 %	-3	-9 %
42. Vermont	Canada	32 %	Canada	38 %	-7	-17 %
43. Florida	Cuba	25 %	Cuba	30 %	-5	-17 %
44. Pennsylvania	Former USSR	9 %	Italy	11 %	-2	-18 %
45. Ohio	India	8 %	Germany	10 %	-2	-20 %
46. Massachusetts	Portugal	10 %	Portugal	13 %	-3	-23 %
47. Michigan	Mexico	12 %	Canada	15 %	-3	-23 %
48. Maine	Canada	39 %	Canada	51 %	-12	-23 %
49. Rhode Island	Portugal	19 %	Portugal	25 %	-7	-26 %
50. New Hampshire	Canada	23 %	Canada	32 %	-9	-28 %
51. Connecticut	Poland	8 %	Italy	13 %	-5	-37 %

Source: Center for Immigration Studies analyses of 1990 and 2000 Public Use Micro data files.
Figures may not exactly match published numbers in every case because public use data files are slightly different from those used by the Census Bureau. Percentages may not match due to rounding.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Table 3. Growth in Immigrant Population for Leading Countries in 1990 and 2000, Ranked by Numerical Increase

Country	2000	1990	Numerical Increase	Growth Rate
1. Mexico	9,161,419	4,224,744	4,936,675	117 %
2. China/HK/Taiw.	1,492,532	920,054	572,478	62 %
3. India	1,018,393	448,608	569,785	127 %
4. Former USSR	890,530	394,680	495,850	126 %
5. Philippines	1,394,675	910,396	484,279	53 %
6. Vietnam	986,198	532,401	453,797	85 %
7. Dominican Repub.	710,985	340,183	370,802	109 %
8. El Salvador	824,692	461,733	362,959	79 %
9. Korea	857,387	555,942	301,445	54 %
10. Guatemala	468,583	220,028	248,555	113 %
11. Colombia	500,413	284,118	216,295	76 %
12. Haiti	408,731	218,694	190,037	87 %
13. Jamaica	513,228	332,481	180,747	54 %
14. Honduras	253,615	104,016	149,599	144 %
15. Ecuador	281,137	137,885	143,252	104 %
16. Cuba	878,085	735,467	142,618	19 %
17. Former Yugoslavia	274,602	139,635	134,967	97 %
18. Pakistan	218,777	84,782	133,995	158 %
19. Brazil	211,260	81,960	129,300	158 %
20. Peru	268,896	143,649	125,247	87 %
21. Canada	843,880	741,688	102,192	14 %
22. Poland	480,492	390,570	89,922	23 %
23. Guyana	200,837	118,102	82,735	70 %
24. Nigeria	137,440	55,377	82,063	148 %
25. Trinidad & Tobago	194,083	115,555	78,528	68 %
26. Iran	282,326	209,289	73,037	35 %
27. Nicaragua	232,039	166,588	65,451	39 %
28. Thailand	168,158	105,872	62,286	59 %
29. Japan	345,566	287,318	58,248	20 %
30. Romania	141,901	94,645	47,256	50 %
31. Argentina	131,018	92,331	38,687	42 %
32. United Kingdom	674,211	641,360	32,851	5 %
33. France	145,724	118,512	27,212	23 %
34. Cambodia	141,055	119,358	21,697	18 %
35. Laos	196,079	177,076	19,003	11 %
36. Portugal	221,282	213,635	7,647	4 %
37. Germany	712,175	716,969	-4,794	-1 %
38. Ireland	161,801	170,293	-8,492	-5 %
39. Greece	163,645	174,025	-10,380	-6 %
40. Italy	473,756	579,708	-105,952	-18 %

Source: Center for Immigration Studies analyses of 1990 and 2000 Public Use Micro data files. Figures may not exactly match published numbers in every case because public use data files are slightly different from those used by the Census Bureau.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Table 4. Growth in Immigrant Populations in the United States by Regions of the World, 1990 and 2000

Country	2000	1990	Numericial Increase	Growth Rate
1. Latin Amer. (Spanish-Speaking)	14,203,404	7,224,046	6,979,358	97 %
2. East Asia	5,764,587	3,720,367	2,044,220	55 %
3. Europe	5,046,543	4,350,669	695,874	16 %
4. Non-Spanish Western Hemp.	1,746,108	1,029,525	716,583	70 %
5. South Asia	1,370,291	568,159	802,132	141 %
6. Middle East	1,081,851	740,296	341,555	46 %
7. Canada	843,880	741,688	102,192	14 %
8. Sub-Saharan Africa	610,084	223,005	387,079	174 %
9. Oceana/Not Indicated	329,201	988,237	-659,036	-67 %
Totals	**30,995,949**	**19,585,992**	**11,409,957**	**58 %**

Source: Center for Immigration Studies analyses of 1990 and 2000 Public Use Micro data files. Figures may not exactly match published numbers in every case because public use data files are slightly different from those used by the Census Bureau.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Table 5. Top Sending Region of the World by State 1990 and 2000, Ranked by Change in Diversity

	2000		1990		
State	Sending Counry	Percentage of Total	Sending Country	Percentage of Total	Percentage Point Change
1. Arkansas	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	56 %	Europe	30 %	26
2. Colorado	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	56 %	Europe	32 %	24
3. Oklahoma	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	51 %	East Asia	27 %	24
4. Kansas	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	53 %	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	30 %	23
5. North Carolina	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	53 %	Europe	31 %	22
6. Wyoming	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	49 %	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	27 %	22
7. Utah	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	53 %	Europe	31 %	22
8. Georgia	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	46 %	East Asia	25 %	21
9. Oregon	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	44 %	East Asia	25 %	19
10. Idaho	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	60 %	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	44 %	16
11. Nevada	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	59 %	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	44 %	15
12. Arizona	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	71 %	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	58 %	13
13. Alabama	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	41 %	Europe	30 %	11
14. Nebraska	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	49 %	Europe	38 %	11
15. Tennessee	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	39 %	East Asia	29 %	10
16. Illinois	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	46 %	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	36 %	10
17. Alaska	East Asia	52 %	East Asia	43 %	9
18. New Mexico	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	74 %	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	66 %	8
19. District of Columbia	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	39 %	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	33 %	6
20. California	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	55 %	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	49 %	6
21. Texas	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	74 %	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	68 %	6
22. Florida	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	57 %	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	51 %	6
23. Kentucky	Europe	28 %	East Asia	25 %	3
24. Mississippi	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	35 %	Europe	32 %	3
25. Hawaii	East Asia	82 %	East Asia	80 %	2
26. Louisiana	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	35 %	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	33 %	2
27. Maryland	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	24 %	East Asia	23 %	1
28. New York	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	30 %	Europe	30 %	0
29. Virginia	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	30 %	East Asia	30 %	0
30. South Carolina	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	40 %	Europe	40 %	0
31. Indiana	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	39 %	Europe	40 %	-1
32. Washington	East Asia	34 %	East Asia	36 %	-2
33. New Hampshire	Europe	30 %	Canada	32 %	-2
34. Vermont	Europe	36 %	Canada	38 %	-2
35. New Jersey	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	34 %	Europe	36 %	-2
36. Minnesota	East Asia	34 %	East Asia	37 %	-3
37. Iowa	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	30 %	East Asia	33 %	-3
38. Montana	Canada	40 %	Europe	44 %	-4
39. Massachusetts	Europe	34 %	Europe	42 %	-8
40. North Dakota	Canada	30 %	Europe	38 %	-8
41. Delaware	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	30 %	Europe	39 %	-9
42. Rhode island	Europe	36 %	Europe	46 %	-10
43. West Virginia	Europe	34 %	Europe	45 %	-11
44. Missouri	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	27 %	Europe	39 %	-12
45. Maine	Canada	39 %	Canada	51 %	-12
46. Connecticut	Europe	39 %	Europe	52 %	-13
47. Wisconsin	Latin Amer. (Spanish-Spkg.)	35 %	Europe	48 %	-13
48. Michigan	Europe	30 %	Europe	43 %	-13
49. Pennsylvania	Europe	37 %	Europe	51 %	-14
50. Ohio	Europe	37 %	Europe	53 %	-16
51. South Dakota	Europe	25 %	Europe	45 %	-20

Note: For purposes of this study, Spanish-speaking countries of the Western Hemisphere are grouped together. Anglophone, Francophone, and Lusophone countries are also grouped together as a separate region. Percentages may not match due to rounding.
Source: Center for Immigration Studies analyses of 1990 and 2000 Public Use Micro data.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Table 6. Top Seven States of Settlement for the Top-100 Immigrant-Sending Countries in 1990

Country of Origin	Total Immigrants in United States	1. State	Total Immigrants	2. State	Total Immigrants	3. State	Total Immigrants	4. State	Total Immigrants	5. State	Total Immigrants	6. State	Total Immigrants	7. State	Total Immigrants
1. Mexico	4,224,744	CA	2,434,652	TX	888,026	IL	274,476	AZ	150,606	FL	54,414	NM	48,414	WA	44,493
2. China/HK/Taiwan	920,054	CA	382,992	NY	188,985	TX	38,141	NJ	34,328	MA	31,047	IL	29,985	WA	18,432
3. Philippines	910,396	CA	484,277	HI	74,957	NY	49,275	IL	47,370	NJ	38,043	WA	27,621	TX	25,929
4. Canada	741,688	CA	150,084	FL	76,517	NY	57,754	MI	53,807	MA	52,910	WA	43,893	CT	21,987
5. Cuba	735,467	FL	495,849	NJ	61,280	NY	53,005	CA	50,028	IL	12,315	TX	11,718	MA	5,069
6. Germany	716,969	CA	105,413	NY	92,431	FL	55,628	NJ	43,421	IL	41,592	TX	34,398	PA	27,998
7. United Kingdom	641,360	CA	135,995	NY	68,330	FL	60,523	NJ	34,848	TX	27,917	MA	27,217	PA	25,544
8. Italy	579,708	NY	189,759	NJ	69,449	CA	47,257	PA	40,381	MA	38,413	CT	34,973	IL	34,368
9. Korea	555,942	CA	197,000	NY	71,389	IL	28,818	NJ	27,949	VA	23,385	TX	22,680	WA	20,784
10. Vietnam	532,401	CA	267,883	TX	53,871	VA	19,485	WA	16,224	NY	15,045	PA	13,029	MA	13,021
11. El Salvador	461,733	CA	279,010	TX	45,917	NY	38,400	VA	21,003	MD	13,865	NJ	13,853	FL	10,045
12. India	448,608	CA	85,054	NY	69,129	NJ	52,672	IL	38,235	TX	31,953	PA	18,013	MD	17,547
13. Former USSR	394,680	NY	103,938	CA	84,739	IL	26,982	FL	23,192	NJ	23,192	PA	20,484	MA	19,026
14. Poland	390,570	NY	89,136	IL	83,574	NJ	39,441	CA	29,057	FL	25,209	CT	20,916	MI	19,156
15. Dominican Republic	340,183	NY	235,790	NJ	35,179	FL	23,556	MA	19,044	RI	5,980	CA	3,684	MD	2,142
16. Jamaica	332,481	NY	143,298	FL	76,853	NJ	22,052	CT	16,328	MD	11,875	CA	11,277	MA	8,161
17. Japan	287,318	CA	97,238	NY	26,627	HI	18,389	WA	12,726	NJ	12,623	TX	10,534	IL	9,636
18. Colombia	284,118	NY	83,570	FL	65,066	NJ	40,354	CA	31,093	TX	12,426	IL	7,638	MA	6,492
19. Guatemala	220,028	CA	135,284	NY	17,480	IL	11,163	FL	10,094	TX	10,009	NJ	5,344	MA	5,217
20. Haiti	218,694	NY	85,086	FL	81,837	MA	18,716	NJ	14,700	CT	3,270	MD	3,064	IL	2,907
21. Portugal	213,635	MA	72,015	CA	38,646	NJ	34,598	RI	23,702	NY	14,183	CT	14,082	PA	4,476
22. Iran	209,289	CA	117,184	NY	15,485	TX	10,310	VA	8,325	MD	7,125	FL	4,939	IL	4,518
23. Laos	177,076	CA	74,228	MN	15,153	WI	12,183	TX	9,627	WA	5,112	IL	4,794	GA	4,172
24. Greece	174,025	NY	42,656	IL	19,920	CA	15,836	MA	13,863	NJ	13,133	PA	8,987	FL	8,233
25. Ireland	170,293	NY	53,465	MA	20,764	CA	18,552	NJ	14,332	IL	13,725	FL	7,824	PA	7,614
26. Nicaragua	166,588	FL	72,017	CA	57,754	NY	8,057	TX	5,582	NJ	3,605	LA	3,378	MD	3,049
27. Peru	143,649	CA	37,859	NY	26,863	FL	22,661	NJ	19,911	TX	4,586	MD	4,384	VA	4,350
28. Former Yugoslavia	139,635	NY	28,807	IL	20,565	CA	18,361	OH	15,257	MI	10,838	NJ	9,989	FL	5,416
29. Ecuador	137,885	NY	65,678	NJ	20,186	CA	18,644	FL	10,788	IL	6,531	TX	2,450	CT	2,344
30. Cambodia	119,358	CA	58,001	MA	10,868	WA	7,878	TX	5,472	PA	4,264	VA	3,192	MN	3,176
31. France	118,512	CA	26,566	NY	18,004	FL	10,043	NJ	6,127	TX	5,201	VA	3,696	PA	3,685
32. Guyana	118,102	NY	76,536	NJ	10,169	FL	8,559	MD	5,164	CA	4,550	TX	1,701	MN	1,330
33. Trinidad & Tobago	115,555	NY	63,226	FL	10,978	MD	6,710	NJ	6,569	CA	6,493	TX	3,636	MA	3,475
34. Hungary	109,739	NY	21,430	CA	18,673	NJ	10,292	FL	**8,927**	OH	8,575	IL	5,604	PA	5,301

Source: Center for Immigration Studies analyses of 1990 and 2000 Public Use Micro data files.
Figures may not exactly match published numbers in every case because public use data files are slightly different from those used by the Census Bureau.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Table 6. (cont.) Top Seven States of Settlement for the Top-100 Immigrant-Sending Countries in 1990

Country of Origin	Total Immigrants in United States	1. State	Total Immigrants	2. State	Total Immigrants	3. State	Total Immigrants	4. State	Total Immigrants	5. State	Total Immigrants	6. State	Total Immigrants	7. State	Total Immigrants
35. Thailand	105,872	CA	42,592	NY	5,892	TX	5,599	FL	4,676	IL	3,957	MN	3,666	WA	3,549
36. Honduras	104,016	CA	24,952	FL	22,069	NY	19,083	TX	9,795	LA	7,221	NJ	4,943	MA	2,800
37. Israel/Palestine	103,484	CA	29,654	NY	26,677	NJ	7,590	FL	6,018	IL	4,800	TX	3,734	MA	2,828
38. Romania	94,645	NY	22,768	CA	18,422	IL	9,909	MI	5,763	FL	5,655	OH	4,919	NJ	4,263
39. Netherlands	94,471	CA	25,662	MI	8,384	NY	7,150	FL	5,674	NJ	4,852	WA	3,390	IL	3,318
40. Argentina	92,331	CA	26,025	NY	18,461	FL	13,820	NJ	7,790	TX	4,560	IL	2,907	MD	2,119
41. Lebanon	87,997	NY	1,975	NJ	1,307	MD	1,167	CA	703	VA	687	TX	635	MN	542
42. Austria	86,801	NY	20,014	CA	11,155	FL	7,835	IL	5,619	NJ	5,094	PA	4,724	OH	4,189
43. Former Czech.	85,401	NY	16,697	CA	12,629	IL	6,801	FL	6,643	NJ	6,265	PA	5,728	OH	5,058
44. Pakistan	84,782	NY	18,577	CA	14,671	IL	7,674	TX	7,563	NJ	6,135	VA	4,404	FL	3,239
45. Panama	83,325	NY	27,794	CA	12,179	FL	11,659	TX	4,621	VA	2,643	NJ	2,445	GA	2,139
46. Brazil	81,960	NY	13,842	CA	12,956	MA	10,830	NJ	10,166	FL	8,682	CT	3,353	TX	3,270
47. Spain	77,911	FL	14,689	CA	13,496	NY	12,323	NJ	10,558	TX	3,214	MD	2,017	MA	1,728
48. Egypt	67,832	CA	16,896	NY	16,003	NJ	10,363	FL	2,903	TX	2,298	MD	1,916	IL	1,863
49. Chile	56,914	CA	15,303	NY	9,672	FL	9,621	NJ	4,318	TX	2,081	VA	1,950	MD	1647
50. Nigeria	55,377	TX	9,343	CA	6,426	NY	6,078	MD	5,306	GA	3,538	NJ	3,291	IL	1,719
51. Sweden	54,562	CA	11,329	NY	4,965	FL	4,656	IL	4,554	WA	3,204	MN	2,706	MA	2,192
52. Turkey	54,153	CA	13,152	NY	10,980	NJ	5,295	MA	2,748	FL	2,418	MI	1,858	VA	1,815
53. Indonesia	47,552	CA	24,175	NY	2,865	TX	1,822	FL	1,395	OR	1,265	WA	1,206	MI	985
54. Iraq	43,924	MI	13,994	CA	12,888	IL	7,872	NY	1,831	TX	1,193	NJ	555	AZ	515
55. Costa Rica	42,709	CA	13,734	NY	7,296	FL	6,130	NJ	3,782	TX	2,158	MA	1,365	IL	777
56. Norway	42,368	CA	5,964	WA	5,625	NY	5,528	FL	3,327	NJ	2,260	IL	2,070	MN	1,925
57. Barbados	42,287	NY	27,301	MA	3,332	FL	2,907	NJ	1,624	CA	1,210	PA	1,193	CT	1,170
58. Australia	41,443	CA	12,626	NY	3,747	FL	2,371	TX	2,093	IL	1,557	NJ	1,529	VA	1,317
59. Venezuela	41,281	FL	14,481	NY	5,118	CA	4,619	TX	2,766	NJ	2,488	MA	1,735	MD	1,012
60. Switzerland	38,454	CA	11,020	NY	5,185	NJ	2,482	FL	2,321	TX	1,393	IL	1,371	OH	975
61. Syria	37,382	CA	13,397	NY	3,454	NJ	3,095	IL	2,283	MA	2,013	PA	1,962	FL	1,614
62. Denmark	37,303	CA	10,564	FL	3,037	NY	2,731	WA	1,581	NJ	1,491	IL	1,425	WI	1,242
63. Ethiopia	35,643	CA	10,080	MD	3,618	VA	3,033	TX	2,859	DC	1,769	GA	1,740	NY	1,722
64. South Africa	34,652	CA	9,939	NY	3,242	FL	2,584	TX	2,228	NJ	1,650	MA	1,460	IL	1,269
65. Belgium	33,721	CA	6,523	NY	5,408	FL	3,069	MI	2,346	IL	1,536	NJ	1,439	TX	1,399
66. Malaysia	32,309	CA	8,261	NY	3,711	TX	3,452	IL	1,371	OH	1,226	FL	950	NJ	928
67. Belize	30,151	CA	13,051	NY	8,284	IL	2,520	FL	1,465	TX	1,149	LA	828	NJ	429

Source: Center for Immigration Studies analyses of 1990 and 2000 Public Use Micro data files.
Figures may not exactly match published numbers in every case because public use data files are slightly different from those used by the Census Bureau.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Table 6. (cont.) Top Seven States of Settlement for the Top-100 Immigrant-Sending Countries in 1990

Country of Origin	Total Immigrants in United States	1. State	Total Immigrants	2. State	Total Immigrants	3. State	Total Immigrants	4. State	Total Immigrants	5. State	Total Immigrants	6. State	Total Immigrants	7. State	Total Immigrants
68. Jordan	30,030	CA	7,749	NY	3,309	IL	2,568	TX	2,272	MI	1,959	OH	1,855	NJ	1,715
69. Bolivia	29,145	CA	6,422	VA	5,478	NY	3,568	FL	2,957	MD	2,561	NJ	1,419	IL	1,071
70. Afghanistan	28,328	CA	12,524	NY	4,539	VA	4,494	TX	1,401	NJ	587	IL	546	CO	477
71. Finland	21,780	CA	4,302	FL	2,987	NY	1,809	MN	1,333	MI	1,312	MA	1,188	NJ	913
72. Bahamas	21,562	FL	13,751	NY	2,443	TX	592	CA	414	MD	384	GA	334	PA	314
73. Bangladesh	21,132	NY	9,236	CA	3,027	NJ	1,454	TX	960	VA	618	OH	614	MD	587
74. Uruguay	21,074	NY	5,607	NJ	4,567	CA	2,643	FL	2,461	TX	1,392	MA	674	MD	577
75. Ghana	20,118	NY	5,939	MD	2,574	NJ	1,760	IL	1,377	VA	1,095	CA	1,094	TX	1,083
76. Burma	19,508	CA	10,135	NY	2,846	IL	1,080	MA	782	PA	612	OH	543	MD	521
77. Dominica	18,115	NY	9,122	NJ	3,866	MA	1,714	FL	1,257	TX	671	CT	429	PA	211
78. Grenada	16,457	NY	11,693	FL	1,077	MD	776	NJ	735	TX	580	CA	262	MA	211
79. Fiji	16,354	CA	14,169	WA	639	OR	391	HI	272	TX	165	MD	75	NV	59
80. Morocco	15,784	NY	3,950	CA	2,895	FL	1,903	VA	879	NJ	754	MA	672	TX	618
81. New Zealand	15,617	CA	5,319	WA	981	NY	799	TX	667	HI	653	VA	576	FL	524
82. Cape Verde	15,136	MA	9,927	RI	3,794	CT	461	NY	267	MD	182	CA	138	NJ	138
83. Kenya	13,788	CA	3,237	TX	1,942	NJ	1,357	NY	763	FL	712	MD	704	IL	537
84. Sri Lanka	13,565	CA	3,365	NY	1,615	MN	1,186	MD	761	NJ	709	FL	547	TX	536
85. Saudi Arabia	13,046	CA	2,627	NY	1,023	IL	960	MI	877	VA	774	OH	557	FL	492
86. St. Vincent	12,173	NY	10,085	FL	518	MA	342	MD	229	NJ	214	CA	165	IL	87
87. Singapore	12,138	CA	4,769	NY	1,602	TX	808	IL	615	NJ	430	MI	336	VA	324
88. Antigua-Barbuda	11,767	NY	7,178	FL	1,626	MA	548	TX	430	NJ	404	CA	287	PA	211
89. Western Samoa	11,140	CA	5,386	HI	2,668	UT	656	WA	477	MO	266	VA	213	PA	153
90. Tonga	10,530	CA	5,490	HI	1,776	UT	1,712	AK	431	AZ	263	TX	226	FL	188
91. Liberia	10,482	NY	1,975	NJ	1,307	MD	1,167	CA	703	VA	687	TX	635	MN	542
92. Malta	9,967	MI	2,798	NY	2,551	CA	2,286	FL	899	NJ	274	PA	164	TX	139
93. Cyprus	9,379	NY	3,413	NJ	1,287	CA	692	VA	579	FL	513	MD	358	OH	337
94. Bulgaria	8,762	CA	2,353	NY	1,645	FL	652	IL	600	NJ	460	MI	437	OH	261
95. Kuwait	8,373	CA	1,496	TX	719	OH	557	FL	517	IL	501	OR	494	NY	402
96. Bermuda	7,833	FL	1,055	NY	949	NJ	712	MA	702	CA	537	VA	489	GA	451
97. St. Kitts-Nevis	7,497	NY	3,756	FL	1,495	CA	324	TX	300	MD	290	NJ	204	NC	180
98. Uganda	7,434	CA	965	NY	860	TX	618	MA	593	IL	564	MD	445	NJ	445
99. St. Lucia	7,424	NY	4,608	FL	671	TX	476	NJ	307	CA	273	MD	271	CT	253
100. Sierra Leone	6,545	MD	1,225	CA	808	NY	671	NJ	595	VA	489	TX	431	MA	303

Source: Center for Immigration Studies analyses of 1990 and 2000 Public Use Micro data files.
Figures may not exactly match published numbers in every case because public use data files are slightly different from those used by the Census Bureau.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Table 7. Top Seven States of Settlement for the Top-100 Immigrant-Sending Countries in 2000

Country of Origin	Total Immigrants in United States	1. State	Total Immigrants	2. State	Total Immigrants	3. State	Total Immigrants	4. State	Total Immigrants	5. State	Total Immigrants	6. State	Total Immigrants	7. State	Total Immigrants
1. Mexico	9,161,419	CA	3,889,695	TX	1,870,787	IL	609,068	AZ	435,001	GA	196,011	CO	192,427	FL	189,819
2. China/HK/Taiw.	1,492,532	CA	556,283	NY	292,717	NJ	71,035	TX	67,366	MA	53,495	IL	50,383	WA	35,876
3. Philippines	1,394,675	CA	670,560	HI	104,862	NY	74,061	NJ	70,670	IL	67,840	WA	46,382	TX	45,665
4. India	1,018,393	CA	197,918	NY	117,889	NJ	117,687	IL	86,242	TX	78,172	MI	39,470	PA	38,767
5. Vietnam	986,198	CA	408,581	TX	104,356	WA	41,636	FL	33,260	GA	32,811	MA	31,805	VA	31,479
6. Former USSR	890,530	NY	233,724	CA	181,800	IL	56,274	NJ	47,687	PA	44,998	WA	43,846	MA	38,561
7. Cuba	878,085	FL	652,660	NJ	52,515	CA	40,644	NY	37,749	TX	15,581	IL	9,547	NV	7,206
8. Korea	857,387	CA	269,346	NY	91,568	NJ	50,092	VA	39,346	IL	37,787	WA	36,811	TX	34,469
9. Canada	843,880	CA	135,135	FL	100,922	NY	58,548	MI	53,704	WA	48,666	TX	40,247	MA	38,043
10. El Salvador	824,692	CA	375,356	TX	98,247	NY	69,191	VA	55,293	MD	37,980	NJ	25,547	FL	24,685
11. Germany	712,175	CA	92,481	NY	67,544	FL	64,409	TX	40,041	NJ	34,154	IL	33,882	PA	24,230
12. Dominican Rep.	710,985	NY	415,026	NJ	106,120	FL	69,449	MA	41,551	RI	16,172	PA	9,078	CT	6,974
13. United Kingdom	674,211	CA	131,648	FL	73,029	NY	61,627	TX	34,385	NJ	31,206	MA	25,658	VA	21,049
14. Jamaica	513,228	NY	214,993	FL	127,591	NJ	30,010	CT	28,757	MD	20,804	MA	13,749	GA	11,845
15. Colombia	500,413	FL	157,307	NY	112,484	NJ	79,902	CA	29,105	TX	18,567	MA	14,628	CT	13,222
16. Poland	480,492	IL	139,729	NY	97,643	NJ	59,182	CT	29,861	FL	24,764	CA	24,628	MI	16,296
17. Italy	473,756	NY	147,372	NJ	58,699	CA	39,932	FL	31,088	MA	30,208	PA	28,752	CT	26,443
18. Guatemala	468,583	CA	205,885	FL	35,499	NY	26,722	IL	22,355	TX	21,540	NJ	16,841	VA	15,095
19. Haiti	408,731	FL	166,778	NY	123,737	MA	33,640	NJ	29,620	IL	7,602	CT	7,019	PA	5,508
20. Japan	345,566	CA	111,453	NY	33,383	HI	19,840	WA	14,912	IL	13,833	TX	13,174	FL	11,295
21. Iran	282,326	CA	160,456	NY	18,261	TX	13,557	MD	11,734	VA	10,979	FL	8,927	IL	5,392
22. Ecuador	281,137	NY	127,451	NJ	43,224	FL	27,326	CA	24,340	CT	10,127	IL	9,288	MA	4,711
23. Peru	268,896	FL	49,919	CA	49,444	NJ	43,436	NY	40,190	VA	16,661	TX	11,612	MD	6,396
24. Former Yugoslavia	274,602	NY	50,801	IL	35,258	CA	28,421	MI	17,017	OH	15,568	NJ	15,372	FL	12,569
25. Honduras	253,615	FL	50,599	CA	42,614	NY	37,530	TX	31,430	NJ	17,779	LA	9,317	VA	7,802
26. Nicaragua	232,039	FL	98,021	CA	70,001	NY	11,525	TX	11,180	LA	5,918	VA	4,176	NJ	3,565
27. Portugal	221,282	MA	75,382	CA	35,778	NJ	35,273	RI	23,357	NY	16,596	CT	14,821	FL	5,398
28. Pakistan	218,777	NY	44,737	CA	30,640	TX	28,714	IL	21,893	NJ	19,257	VA	15,950	FL	8,832
29. Brazil	211,260	FL	43,082	MA	38,566	CA	23,577	NY	20,857	NJ	20,519	CT	10,726	TX	7,175
30. Guyana	200,837	NY	130,154	FL	17,034	NJ	14,402	CA	6,546	MD	4,877	GA	4,012	TX	3,569
31. Laos	196,079	CA	63,574	MN	26,281	WI	15,762	TX	10,452	NC	6,456	WA	5,891	MI	5,707
32. Trinidad & Tobago	194,083	NY	97,073	FL	27,989	NJ	12,738	MD	12,466	CA	7,489	TX	5,418	MA	5,388
33. Thailand	168,158	CA	64,889	MN	10,229	WA	8,419	NY	7,807	IL	6,809	TX	6,557	WI	6,205
34. Greece	163,645	NY	35,980	NJ	18,360	IL	17,708	MA	13,938	CA	13,820	FL	9,636	PA	8,693

Source: Center for Immigration Studies analyses of 1990 and 2000 Public Use Micro data files.
Figures may not exactly match published numbers in every case because public use data files are slightly different from those used by the Census Bureau.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Table 7. (cont.) Top Seven States of Settlement for the Top-100 Immigrant-Sending Countries in 2000

Country of Origin	Total Immigrants in United States	1. State	Total Immigrants	2. State	Total Immigrants	3. State	Total Immigrants	4. State	Total Immigrants	5. State	Total Immigrants	6. State	Total Immigrants	7. State	Total Immigrants
35. Ireland	161,801	NY	46,302	CA	20,301	MA	17,918	NJ	12,853	IL	11,465	FL	10,201	PA	6,126
36. France	145,724	CA	31,522	NY	18,403	FL	12,335	TX	10,459	NJ	7,713	IL	7,154	MA	5,366
37. Romania	141,901	NY	28,634	CA	22,493	IL	11,109	MI	9,733	FL	7,938	OH	7,711	NJ	5,753
38. Cambodia	141,055	CA	47,083	WA	17,160	MA	12,616	TX	8,091	PA	7,964	VA	4,457	MN	4,346
39. Nigeria	137,440	TX	22,421	CA	18,730	NY	15,505	MD	14,528	IL	7,221	GA	6,492	NJ	5,925
40. Argentina	131,018	CA	27,528	FL	27,236	NY	17,864	TX	9,938	NJ	8,434	MD	5,413	CT	3,252
41. Israel/Palestine	109,255	NY	31,227	CA	29,610	NJ	8,608	FL	8,315	IL	5,413	MA	3,615	MD	3,198
42. Panama	109,060	NY	28,293	FL	16,057	CA	13,996	TX	8,392	GA	4,496	NJ	3,703	WA	3,093
43. Bangladesh	106,717	NY	50,508	CA	13,692	NJ	6,276	TX	4,821	MI	4,720	FL	3,966	MD	3,432
44. Egypt	106,605	CA	24,047	NY	18,366	NJ	16,975	VA	5,863	TX	4,079	FL	4,059	PA	3,848
45. Venezuela	102,199	FL	47,646	NY	10,047	NJ	7,062	TX	6,027	CA	4,430	IL	2,965	MD	2,425
46. Lebanon	97,979	CA	30,911	MI	17,072	MA	6,831	OH	5,362	FL	4,378	NJ	3,911	NY	3,910
47. Netherlands	94,125	CA	24,609	NY	7,371	MI	5,978	FL	5,684	TX	4,733	WA	3,994	IL	3,678
48. Hungary	93,128	CA	17,396	NY	16,731	FL	8,630	NJ	7,976	OH	7,061	IL	4,378	PA	4,155
49. Iraq	91,180	MI	27,176	CA	25,074	IL	11,081	NY	3,588	PA	2,904	TN	2,829	VA	2,328
50. Former Czech.	85,136	CA	13,949	NY	11,608	IL	8,991	FL	7,106	NJ	5,725	PA	4,162	WI	2,585
51. Chile	78,008	FL	18,132	NY	14,174	CA	12,078	NJ	5,935	VA	3,818	TX	3,520	NC	2,219
52. Spain	77,315	FL	14,460	CA	12,700	NY	9,426	NJ	8,952	TX	4,098	VA	3,269	GA	1,799
53. Indonesia	72,618	CA	32,734	NY	5,094	TX	2,837	WA	2,658	MD	2,437	OR	2,372	IL	2,306
54. Turkey	71,315	NY	14,241	CA	11,847	NJ	10,815	TX	3,520	MA	2,798	VA	2,686	PA	2,559
55. Ethiopia	69,966	CA	12,410	VA	8,305	WA	5,620	MD	5,213	MN	4,435	TX	3,987	GA	3,089
56. Costa Rica	67,328	FL	12,837	CA	12,797	NJ	9,812	NY	7,883	TX	4,727	NC	3,775	SC	3,300
57. Ghana	64,448	NY	13,966	NJ	9,484	MD	8,214	VA	5,573	CA	4,467	GA	3,431	IL	3,273
58. Bolivia	61,452	VA	13,316	CA	9,779	MD	7,528	NY	7,235	FL	6,471	NJ	3,026	TX	2,602
59. South Africa	61,238	CA	15,152	FL	5,399	TX	4,786	NY	4,337	GA	2,937	IL	2,394	MD	2,006
60. Australia	59,685	CA	17,480	NY	7,849	TX	2,696	FL	2,506	NJ	2,438	PA	2,338	WA	1,956
61. Austria	57,582	CA	8,672	NY	7,900	FL	5,613	IL	3,880	NJ	3,833	MI	2,847	TX	2,492
62. Malaysia	53,227	CA	12,198	NY	10,733	TX	4,256	MN	2,303	PA	1,827	NJ	1,820	FL	1,706
63. Sweden	51,896	CA	12,564	NY	3,989	FL	3,929	IL	3,599	MA	3,058	TX	2,626	NJ	2,258
64. Barbados	50,885	NY	29,446	FL	3,909	MA	3,665	NJ	2,726	PA	2,294	MD	1,247	TX	1,247
65. Syria	50,151	CA	17,204	NY	5,206	IL	4,466	NJ	4,351	PA	3,668	FL	2,478	TX	2,396
66. Jordan	49,650	CA	12,227	NY	5,454	TX	5,148	MI	4,498	NJ	4,194	IL	4,173	VA	1,767
67. Afghanistan	48,475	CA	21,804	NY	7,166	VA	3,647	GA	1,977	CO	1,563	MD	1,381	NJ	1,253

Source: Center for Immigration Studies analyses of 1990 and 2000 Public Use Micro data files.
Figures may not exactly match published numbers in every case because public use data files are slightly different from those used by the Census Bureau.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Table 7. (cont.) Top Seven States of Settlement for the Top-100 Immigrant-Sending Countries in 2000

Country of Origin	Total Immigrants in United States	1. State	Total Immigrants	2. State	Total Immigrants	3. State	Total Immigrants	4. State	Total Immigrants	5. State	Total Immigrants	6. State	Total Immigrants	7. State	Total Immigrants
68. Kenya	43,745	TX	6,967	CA	5,643	NY	2,889	GA	2,484	NJ	2,406	MA	2,367	IL	2,146
69. Switzerland	40,798	CA	8,859	NY	5,321	FL	2,703	TX	1,896	NJ	1,815	WA	1,509	NM	1,406
70. Morocco	39,855	NY	6,010	FL	5,937	CA	5,023	MA	3,660	VA	3,318	NJ	3,004	IL	1,591
71. Liberia	39,508	MD	5,478	NY	4,993	NJ	4,331	MN	3,356	GA	3,185	PA	2,167	NC	2,072
72. Belgium	36,485	CA	6,264	NY	4,850	IL	2,829	TX	2,344	MI	2,051	MA	1,910	FL	1,895
73. Bulgaria	35,947	CA	6,039	NY	5,197	IL	4,244	FL	3,239	WA	1,828	MI	1,457	GA	1,455
74. Somalia	34,465	MN	7,995	GA	4,378	CA	3,561	OH	3,290	VA	2,596	WA	2,118	TX	1,668
75. Burma	32,353	CA	18,057	NY	2,712	PA	1,648	TX	1,254	MD	1,111	MA	901	IL	849
76. Belize	32,288	CA	12,453	NY	6,911	IL	4,033	FL	2,941	TX	1,052	LA	581	WI	449
77. Denmark	31,445	CA	9,444	FL	2,133	NY	1,521	IL	1,501	WA	1,221	VA	1,130	MI	1,106
78. Norway	31,179	CA	4,306	WA	3,893	FL	3,167	TX	2,632	NY	2,630	PA	1,739	UT	1,426
79. Grenada	30,877	NY	24,996	FL	2,170	VA	1,079	NJ	633	TX	390	GA	302	CA	270
80. Albania	30,686	NY	8,988	MA	3,698	MI	3,356	CT	2,965	FL	1,950	IL	1,481	PA	1,414
81. Fiji	29,331	CA	23,708	WA	1,741	NY	777	MI	658	OR	621	NM	428	MO	330
82. Uruguay	26,669	NJ	5,190	FL	5,019	NY	4,281	CA	3,151	MA	1,735	PA	1,127	TX	1,092
83. Sri Lanka	26,404	CA	8,150	NY	4,427	TX	1,781	MA	1,450	MD	1,410	NJ	1,252	IL	990
84. Bahamas	25,377	FL	16,567	NY	2,284	GA	1,084	NJ	995	MI	737	MD	566	NC	434
85. Saudi Arabia	24,645	VA	3,312	TX	3,109	CA	2,726	OH	2,200	FL	1,350	NJ	1,308	MI	1,126
86. Tonga	24,541	CA	11,477	UT	5,755	HI	3,406	MO	607	AZ	533	NV	506	SC	421
87. Cape Verde	22,844	MA	12,759	RI	7,007	CN	1,002	NJ	936	NY	379	FL	344	OR	227
88. Sierra Leone	22,207	MD	5,782	VA	3,815	PA	2,184	NJ	2,065	TX	1,519	NY	1,066	GA	1,032
89. Finland	21,778	CA	4,491	FL	4,413	MA	1,506	NY	1,290	TX	1,106	OR	755	CT	664
90. Singapore	21,332	CA	5,197	TX	2,692	NY	2,025	AZ	1,124	NJ	990	GA	810	IL	799
91. Sudan	20,996	VA	3,900	WA	1,856	MD	1,558	CA	1,491	ID	1,136	MN	1,065	NC	1,034
92. Yemen	19,911	NY	8,572	MI	5,602	CA	1,965	OH	855	NC	689	VA	462	CT	333
93. New Zealand	19,837	CA	6,634	WA	1,591	TX	1,309	IL	1,031	VA	870	OR	831	UT	770
94. Dominica	18,828	NY	9,412	FL	3,003	TX	1,112	NJ	1,032	RI	577	MA	552	MD	447
95. Eritrea	18,728	CA	6,049	TX	2,226	WA	2,004	MN	1,397	MD	1,328	VA	968	NY	659
96. St. Vincent	18,463	NY	13,867	FL	1,497	CT	553	PA	429	CA	370	GA	247	NJ	234
97. Kuwait	18,043	CA	3,229	TX	2,466	NY	1,541	PA	1,092	FL	1,056	NC	986	MA	847
98. Antigua-Barbuda	18,013	NY	9,735	FL	3,485	NJ	937	GA	755	MA	430	VA	364	PA	322
99. Western Samoa	15,883	CA	6,073	HI	4,810	UT	1,082	MN	755	WA	656	TX	589	OH	285
100. Cameroon	13,236	MD	3,632	VA	1,501	TX	1,157	NY	1,012	MN	878	GA	866	AZ	759

Source: Center for Immigration Studies analyses of 1990 and 2000 Public Use Micro data files.
Figures may not exactly match published numbers in every case because public use data files are slightly different from those used by the Census Bureau.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Table 8. Percentage of Immigrants in Top State of Settlement, 1990 and 2000 Ranked by Increase in Dispersion

	2000		1990		
Country	Top State	Percentage of Total	Top State	Percentage of Total	Percentage Point Change
1. Guatemala	CA	44 %	CA	61 %	17
2. Mexico	CA	42 %	CA	58 %	16
3. Cambodia	CA	33 %	CA	49 %	16
4. El Salvador	CA	46 %	CA	60 %	14
5. Dominican Republic	NY	58 %	NY	69 %	11
6. Laos	CA	32 %	CA	42 %	10
7. Vietnam	CA	41 %	CA	50 %	9
8. Peru	FL	19 %	CA	26 %	7
9. Argentina	CA	21 %	CA	28 %	7
10. Philippines	CA	48 %	CA	53 %	5
11. Trinidad & Tobago	NY	50 %	NY	55 %	5
12. China/HK/Taiwan	CA	37 %	CA	42 %	5
13. Korea	CA	31 %	CA	35 %	4
14. Canada	CA	16 %	CA	20 %	4
15. Romania	NY	20 %	NY	24 %	4
16. Honduras	FL	20 %	CA	24 %	4
17. Ecuador	NY	45 %	NY	48 %	3
18. Former Yugoslavia	NY	18 %	NY	21 %	3
19. Greece	NY	22 %	NY	25 %	3
20. Ireland	NY	29 %	NY	31 %	2
21. Pakistan	NY	20 %	NY	22 %	2
22. Japan	CA	32 %	CA	34 %	2
23. Italy	NY	31 %	NY	33 %	2
24. Germany	CA	13 %	CA	15 %	2
25. Nicaragua	FL	42 %	FL	43 %	1
26. Thailand	CA	39 %	CA	40 %	1
27. United Kingdom	CA	20 %	CA	21 %	1
28. Jamaica	NY	42 %	NY	43 %	1
29. Nigeria	TX	16 %	TX	17 %	1
30. France	CA	22 %	CA	22 %	0
31. Former USSR	NY	26 %	NY	26 %	0
32. India	CA	19 %	CA	19 %	0
33. Guyana	NY	65 %	NY	65 %	0
34. Portugal	MA	34 %	MA	34 %	0
35. Iran	CA	57 %	CA	56 %	-1
36. Colombia	FL	31 %	NY	29 %	-2
37. Haiti	FL	41 %	NY	39 %	-2
38. Brazil	FL	20 %	NY	17 %	-3
39. Poland	IL	29 %	NY	23 %	-6
40. Cuba	FL	74 %	FL	67 %	-7

Source: Center for Immigration Studies analyses of 1990 and 2000 Public Use Micro data files. Figures may not match published numbers in every case because public use data files are slightly different from those used by the Census Bureau. Percentages may not match due to rounding.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NON-PROFIT
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT #6117
WASHINGTON, DC

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Center for Immigration Studies
1522 K Street NW, Suite 820
Washington, DC 20005-1202

Backgrounder

Where Immigrants Live

An Examination of State Residency of the Foreign Born by Country of Origin in 1990 and 2000

By Steven A. Camarota and Nora McArdle

During the 1990s, the nation's immigrant population grew by 11.3 million — faster than at any other time in our history. Using newly released data from the 2000 Census, this report examines the changing distribution of the nation's immigrant population by country of origin at the state level. The findings show that in one sense, today's immigration is more diverse than ever because people now arrive from every corner of the world. In another sense, however, diversity among the foreign born has actually declined significantly. One country — Mexico — and one region — Spanish-speaking Latin America — have come to dominate U.S. immigration during the decade. The report also found that immigrants from some countries became more spread out in the 1990s, while the dispersion of others changed little.

12-03

Center for Immigration Studies
1522 K Street NW, Suite 820
Washington, DC 20005-1202
(202) 466-8185 • Fax (202) 466-8076
center@cis.org • www.cis.org